

Lake County Schools

Seminole Springs Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Seminole Springs Elementary School

26200 W HUFF RD, Eustis, FL 32736

<https://sse.lake.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Kyle Bracewell

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Lake 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Seminole Springs Elementary School

26200 W HUFF RD, Eustis, FL 32736

<https://sse.lake.k12.fl.us>

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	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake 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.

Seminole Springs Elementary where students LEAD and SUCCEED!

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create a collaborative learning community that develops students who achieve excellence both academically and socially in order to become productive leaders in society.

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
Work, Michelle	Principal	Instructional Evaluations for: Grades 3-5, and VE Support, CRT, Literacy Coach, PASS, ESE Specialist, Interventionist, Guidance and Mental Health. Professional Development Contact Curriculum and Instruction Problem Solving Team Progress Monitoring School Communication (Facebook, Twitter, Week at a Glance) Media Contact MTSS Contact ESE Contact Title 1 Compliance and Budget Allocations/Budget FTE
Abston, Midge	Assistant Principal	
Hargroves, Maria	Instructional Coach	
Grable, Vicky	Other	ESE School Specialist
Schaefer, Helena	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/12/2019, Kyle Bracewell

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

42

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* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	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 8/12/2020

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	94	85	76	85	89	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	514
Attendance below 90 percent	29	11	13	16	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
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	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	4	13	10	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	4	13	10	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
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	94	85	76	85	89	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	514
Attendance below 90 percent	29	11	13	16	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
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	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	4	13	10	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	4	13	10	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
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	63%	58%	57%	62%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	57%	58%	53%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	49%	53%	48%	50%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	71%	60%	63%	66%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	56%	56%	62%	48%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	39%	51%	38%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	54%	53%	47%	49%	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	62%	60%	2%	58%	4%
	2018	62%	61%	1%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	60%	5%	58%	7%
	2018	71%	59%	12%	56%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	56%	59%	-3%	56%	0%
	2018	63%	55%	8%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	76%	62%	14%	62%	14%
	2018	76%	65%	11%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	61%	19%	64%	16%
	2018	71%	60%	11%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	51%	57%	-6%	60%	-9%
	2018	55%	58%	-3%	61%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	57%	56%	1%	53%	4%
	2018	67%	54%	13%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
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	45	54		55	58	58	67				
ELL	50	58		50	42						
HSP	60	53		67	50	25	57				
MUL	50			50							
WHT	65	65	69	75	63	54	64				
FRL	59	53	55	65	49	37	50				
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	42	57	40	46	48	35	75				
ELL	20			50							
HSP	63	67		61	37		45				
MUL	60			80							
WHT	68	57	38	71	47	42	70				
FRL	61	55	47	59	41	43	60				
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	21	25	25	24	24	23	21				
HSP	51	56		59	54	30	31				
MUL	75	64		94	36						
WHT	63	51	50	65	49	42	46				
FRL	52	50	48	56	43	38	40				

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	61
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	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	56
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	55
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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	50
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	65
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	55
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 showed the lowest performance was Math Lowest 25th Percentile. During the 18-19 school year the 5th grade lead math teacher resigned mid-year; this resulted in 50% of the 5th grade students having three different math teachers throughout the year. I feel confident that if we were to have data from 19-20 this would have gone up.

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 greatest decline from the year prior was Science Achievement. The fifth grade instructional staff was inconsistent during the 18-19 school year, possibly causing a

loss of instructional time and targeted instruction. The factor that contributed to this decline is that only 1 out of 4 fifth grade classrooms maintained a consistent teacher. Again, systems were put in place last year, coupled with professional learning that the 19-20 achievement was on target for an increase.

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.

Math Lowest 25th Percentile had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The state average was 51% and the school average was 41%, a 10% gap. The factor that may have contributed to the gap was the fact that the school did not host after school tutoring focusing on math instruction to the Lowest 25%.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. The school average increased from 45% to 62%, a 17% increase. The factors that assisted with the improvement are the ELA after school tutoring program, the ELL after school club, the LCS Focus on Authentic Literacy, and strong academic TAs in K/1.

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

Approximately 37% of Seminole Springs students had two or more early warning indicators. Sixty-three students in grades K-5 had an attendance rate below 90% (approximately 12% of students).

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

1. Math Lowest 25%
2. Science Achievement
3. ELA Achievement
4. Math Achievement (5th Grade)
5. EWS - Attendance below 90% rate

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Seminole Springs Elementary will deliberately and explicitly work on collaboration as it relates to the Instructional Framework.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2020, we would like to see 70% of our classroom learning walks to observe collaborative learning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Work (workm@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through the PLC process, grade level teams will plan and design standards based collaborative learning opportunities for their students. The body of research on cooperative learning, which has informed theory and practice in education for decades, which has informed theory and practice in education for decades, emphasizes the processes that occur within a group, primarily when students are completing a structured task given by the teacher. Here are the five features that define cooperative learning (Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1991):
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive Interdependence Face to Face interaction Individual and group accountability Interpersonal and small-group skills Group processing

Action Steps to Implement

- Continue with book study of Better Teacher Through Structured Learning
- Professional Learning Communities - grade level collaboration for lesson plan design
- Classroom Learning Walks will be conducted to monitor progress toward focus area

Person Responsible Michelle Work (workm@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Seminole Springs Elementary will implement the Leader in Me Framework beginning the 2020-21 school year.
---	--

Measurable Outcome:	Increased attendance percentage.
----------------------------	----------------------------------

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Work (workm@lake.k12.fl.us)
---	--------------------------------------

Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>It is our belief that by focusing on the SEL that is build in to the Leader in Me framework, students will be more likely to want to come to school.</p> <p>These social and emotional skills are some of several short-term student outcomes that SEL programs promote (Durlak et al., 2011; Farrington et al., 2012; Sklad et al., 2012). Other benefits include:</p>
---------------------------------	--

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>More positive attitudes toward oneself, others, and tasks including enhanced self-efficacy, confidence, persistence, empathy, connection and commitment to school, and a sense of purpose</p> <p>More positive social behaviors and relationships with peers and adults</p> <p>Reduced conduct problems and risk-taking behavior</p> <p>Decreased emotional distress</p> <p>Improved test scores, grades, and attendance</p>
---	---

Action Steps to Implement

- Leader in Me Professional Development
- Leader in Me Coaching Support
- Professional Learning Communities

Person Responsible	Michelle Work (workm@lake.k12.fl.us)
---------------------------	--------------------------------------

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Seminole Springs Elementary will support our bottom quartile in the area of reading (determined from the Fall 2020 Baseline iReady Diagnostic) through the use of Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) curriculum. Through the utilization of Title 1 Funding, we have purchased a Potential Specialist and a Teacher Assistant to support our pullout intervention.

In addition to LLI, Seminole Springs Elementary will purchase the online learning support of BrainPop and Tumbleweed to support Level 1 and 2 students in the area of Math and Reading. Now that we are 1-1 with Chromebooks, this will serve as a great support to enhance learning and close gaps.

Measurable Outcome: 100% of students participating in LLI intervention will grow one or more Fountas and Pinnell levels by the end of the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Maria Hargroves (hargrovesm@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The utilization of Leveled Literacy Intervention curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research has proven consistent use of LLI increases student achievement and closes gaps in reading. Other Lake County Schools have shown success through the utilization of this resource.

Action Steps to Implement

- Winter 2020, site visit to Eustis Heights Elementary to see implementation of LLI
- Professional Learning from Potential Specialist (EHES) to Maria Hargroves, CRT (SSE)
- Weekly Professional Learning for Potential Specialist (EES) from Maria Hargroves
- Weekly Classroom Learning Walks to monitor the implementation of the scripted program LLI

Person Responsible: Maria Hargroves (hargrovesm@lake.k12.fl.us)

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We have purchased Science Bootcamp for 5th grade science. In addition to curricular resources, we plan weekly with our teachers and provide professional learning around the standards, and ensuring that the tasks and texts they are putting in front of students are aligned to the full intent of the test item specifications.

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.

During the 2020-21 school year, Seminole Springs Elementary is beginning the journey of The Leader in Me framework. Leader in Me is an evidence-based, comprehensive-school improvement model—developed in partnership with educators—that empowers students with the leadership and life skills they need to thrive in the 21st century. Leader in Me is based on a theory of change known as the See-Do-Get Cycle. When you change the way you See things, it influences what you Do and the results you Get. The Leader in Me experience begins with a whole new paradigm for education. Educators rediscover their passion through Leader in Me as it redirects their focus back to a deeper understanding of student achievement. Many people equate leadership with a formal position of authority. But we believe anyone can be a leader by intentionally leading one's own life (leading self) and working well with and encouraging the greatness in others—whether family, friends, neighbors, or colleagues (leading others).

All internal stakeholders will go through professional learning with ongoing coaching support as a way to build a positive school culture. In addition, our families, in time will participate in training workshops. Leader in Me offers families a powerful framework that aligns to the same principles being taught at school. And it's not just helping kids finish their homework—families collaborate with their local Leader in Me school to encourage their child to cultivate leadership skills, like motivation, self-directed learning, self-confidence, and working well with others.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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