Lake Weston Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Weston Elementary

5500 MILAN DR, Orlando, FL 32810

https://lakewestones.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Meigan Rivera

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: F (31%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: F (23%)
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	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Lake Weston Elementary

5500 MILAN DR, Orlando, FL 32810

https://lakewestones.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 PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	94%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	F	D

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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
Leslie, James	Principal	Building Administrator
Brooke, Nicole	Other	Curriculum Resource Teacher
Lemon-Brookins, Shayana	Assistant Principal	Building Administrator
Ayala, Lauren	Other	ELA Interventionist
Diaz, Edgardo	Other	Math Coach
Hejtmanek, Heather	Other	ELA Interventionist
Rodriguez, Maria	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach
Scheff, Jessica	Instructional Media	Media Specialist
Szymanski, Kelly	Other	ELA Interventionist

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/25/2018, Meigan Rivera

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.*
2

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.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
37

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: F (31%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: F (23%)
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	N/A

* 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	40	76	94	98	94	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	472
Attendance below 90 percent	16	13	27	21	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	9	6	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	13	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	22	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	6	17	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 7/8/2020

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	98	103	94	83	73	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	526
Attendance below 90 percent	30	26	22	13	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	6	8	7	4	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	29	23	8	9	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	22	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	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	98	103	94	83	73	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	526
Attendance below 90 percent	30	26	22	13	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	6	8	7	4	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	29	23	8	9	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	22	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	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	45%	57%	57%	32%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	58%	58%	44%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	52%	53%	47%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	56%	63%	63%	38%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	71%	61%	62%	47%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	48%	51%	43%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	56%	53%	30%	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	39%	55%	-16%	58%	-19%
	2018	33%	55%	-22%	57%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	57%	-5%	58%	-6%
	2018	32%	54%	-22%	56%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
05	2019	39%	54%	-15%	56%	-17%
	2018	24%	55%	-31%	55%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	53%	62%	-9%	62%	-9%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	40%	61%	-21%	62%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	63%	-7%	64%	-8%
	2018	38%	62%	-24%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	53%	57%	-4%	60%	-7%
	2018	14%	59%	-45%	61%	-47%
Same Grade Comparison		39%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	54%	-11%	53%	-10%
	2018	27%	53%	-26%	55%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
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	15	67	64	10	50	47					
ELL	47	73		63	85		55				
BLK	44	67	53	53	63	41	36				
HSP	48	67	71	62	84	77	56				
FRL	45	66	69	56	70	60	45				
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	12	27	29	6	9	13	13				
ELL	26	32	25	38	45	27	20				
BLK	26	33	38	27	26	21	20				
HSP	34	39	25	35	35	20	46				
WHT	38			31							
FRL	29	36	38	29	31	23	29				

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	15	26	23	14	32	42					
ELL	20	43	47	29	46	64					
BLK	28	39	38	37	40	28	32				
HSP	35	47	50	43	57	53	14				
WHT	36			29							
FRL	32	44	44	40	47	41	30				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	65
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	66
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

ELA and Science proficiency were our lowest areas of performance, at 45%. However, this was a 15% increase in ELA and 16% increase in Science over the previous year's scores. Contributing factors are a lack of foundational skills and knowledge of prerequisite standards.

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

N/A - all performance areas showed significant improvement over the previous year.

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.

ELA proficiency showed the largest gap when compared with the state average (12%). The contributing factors are those mentioned in the section above. However, it is important to note that ELA proficiency increased 15% over the previous year's scores.

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

Math learning gains showed the greatest increase (29% to 71%). With the continuation of a new administration and leadership team, there was also a more intense focus on standards based planning, instruction and assessment.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

An additional area of concern would be our attendance data. There are still a significant number of students with an attendance rate below 90%.

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. Science Proficiency
3. Math Proficiency
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will increase the overall ELA proficiency and learning gains by implementing high-quality literacy strategies, providing additional common planning opportunities, a placing a strategic focus on writing and targeted support for differentiating instruction. This area of focus was selected as 45% of our students were proficient on the ELA portion of the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment and 66% of all students demonstrated a learning gain. Although this was a significant increase from the prior year, ELA was one of our lowest performance areas. As a result of the school closures due to the pandemic, we are anticipating an increased level of regression that will need to be addressed.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome is to increase the percentage of students scoring proficient and demonstrating a learning gain on the ELA portion of the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Leslie (james.leslie@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Communities, Professional Development opportunities and strategic coaching support focused on data analysis and differentiating instruction will be utilized to support this area of focus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies will be used in an effort to strengthen instructional practice, specifically with differentiating instruction, which will result in improved instructional effectiveness, ultimately resulting in increased student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development opportunities that target:
a. Strategies to differentiate instruction
b. Effective writing instruction
c. Using PLCs to analyze data and focus instruction

Person Responsible	Shayana Lemon-Brookins (shayana.lemon-brookins@ocps.net)

2. An increased focus on the use of instructional strategies to improve student achievement during structured common planning sessions.

Person Responsible	Shayana Lemon-Brookins (shayana.lemon-brookins@ocps.net)

3. Provide strategic coaching support focused on data analysis and differentiating instruction, to include modeling, side by side teaching and actionable feedback.

Person Responsible	Maria Rodriguez (maria.rodriguez8@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will increase the overall math proficiency and learning gains by closely monitoring for student comprehension during instruction, providing additional common planning opportunities, with a focus on addressing learning gaps and/or regression, and targeted support for differentiating instruction. This area of focus was selected as 56% of our students were proficient on the math portion of the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment and 55% of our lowest 25% demonstrated a learning gain. Although this was a significant increase from the previous year, we want to see a continued increased in math achievement, particularly with our lowest 25%. As a result of the school closures due to the pandemic, we are anticipating an increase in learning gaps that will need to be addressed.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome is to increase the percentage of students scoring proficient and demonstrating a learning gain on the math portion of the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Leslie (james.leslie@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Communities, Professional Development opportunities and strategic coaching support focused on data analysis and differentiating instruction will be utilized to support this area of focus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies will be used in an effort to strengthen instructional practice, specifically with differentiating instruction, which will result in improved instructional effectiveness, ultimately resulting in increased student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development opportunities that target:
a. Strategies to differentiate instruction
b. Using PLCs to analyze data and focus instruction to address learning gaps that may have occurred as the result of school closures.

Person Responsible	Shayana Lemon-Brookins (shayana.lemon-brookins@ocps.net)

2. An increased focus on the use of instructional strategies to improve student achievement during structured common planning sessions.

Person Responsible	Shayana Lemon-Brookins (shayana.lemon-brookins@ocps.net)

3. Include time for math intervention within the daily schedule.

Person Responsible	Edgardo Diaz (edgardo.diaz@ocps.net)

4. Provide strategic coaching support focused on data analysis and differentiating instruction, to include modeling, side by side teaching and actionable feedback.

Person Responsible	Edgardo Diaz (edgardo.diaz@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will increase our focus on Social Emotional Learning, including positive behavioral interventions, opportunities for staff development, and counseling, as a means to provide additional supports and interventions for students in need. This area of focus was selected as there were 91 discipline referrals, 41 suspensions and 31 threat assessments during the 2019 – 2020 school year. This was an increase over the previous year.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome is to decrease the number of discipline referrals, suspensions and threat assessments for the 2020-21 school year as compared to the 2019 – 20 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Leslie (james.leslie@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development opportunities that focus on Social Emotional Learning, including CHAMPS, conflict resolution and de-escalation, equity, and acknowledging and appreciating social diversity will be utilized to support this area of focus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies will be used in an effort to develop teachers' behavioral management techniques and increase appreciation and understanding of social diversity.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development opportunities that target:
a. Behavior Management (CHAMPS)
b. Improving School Culture and Climate (Appreciating Social Diversity)

Person Responsible	James Leslie (james.leslie@ocps.net)

2. Provide more comprehensive and structured counseling services for students to included My Brother's Keeper, small group and individual counseling sessions.

Person Responsible	Karen Paul (karen.paul@ocps.net)

3. Create opportunities for the behavioral team to monitor and analyze discipline data.

Person Responsible	Shayana Lemon-Brookins (shayana.lemon-brookins@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our guidance counselor and assistant principal will coordinate efforts to address improved attendance. These efforts will include, attendance monitoring and parental meetings, referring parents to appropriate agencies for support and enlisting the support of our social worker and the Neighborhood for Children and Families.

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.

Lake Weston provides yearly surveys to stakeholders, including staff, students and parents. The surveys include opportunities for stakeholders to provide input, which is analyzed and considered as we make efforts to improve our culture and environment. We focus on creating an environment at Lake Weston where every student feels safe to try their best. We want students to not be pressured by the results, but proud of the effort and process. We want students to take pride in themselves, their school and community.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA					$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
			0651 - Lake Weston Elementary	TSSSA		$5,000.00	
			Notes: Funds from TSSSA will be used to provide opportunities for additional common planning, data analysis and staff development.				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math					$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
			0651 - Lake Weston Elementary	TSSSA		$5,000.00	
			Notes: Funds from TSSSA will be used to provide opportunities for additional common planning, data analysis and staff development.				
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports					$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
			0651 - Lake Weston Elementary	TSSSA		$5,000.00	
			Notes: Funds from TSSSA will be used to purchase SEL materials and provide opportunities for staff development.				

	Total:	$15,000.00