

Orange County Public Schools

Stone Lakes Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	21
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Stone Lakes Elementary

15200 STONEYBROOK BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

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

Demographics

Principal: Andronidus Rollins

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2021

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

* 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	13
Planning for Improvement	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Stone Lakes Elementary

15200 STONEYBROOK BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	26%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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	Position 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
Benscoter, Jessica	Instructional Coach	Student Achievement Instructional Coach Skyward Captain 5th grade committee liaison PLC

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		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
Nyffeler, Roberta	Staffing Specialist	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
Morris, Alison	School Counselor	SEL Terrific Kids Monthly Celebration Student Counseling Modeling Morning Meetings for teachers Caring Schools Community Implementation SEL resource for teachers
Brock, Carol	Reading Coach	Student Achievement Tier 3 MTSS Resource Survey MTSS Class Visits MTSS Data Collection MTSS Trainings MTSS Monitoring and Teacher Support FLKRS

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		MTSS Resource Facilitator Other duties as assigned
Scott, Natalie	Instructional Technology	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 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) Other duties as assigned

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/30/2021, 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.*

0

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

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

653

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	73	82	95	111	138	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	622
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	6	2	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/30/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				78%	57%	57%	79%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	58%	58%	61%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	52%	53%	47%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				82%	63%	63%	86%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				60%	61%	62%	69%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	48%	51%	65%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				72%	56%	53%	78%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	82%	55%	27%	58%	24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	57%	21%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	84%	62%	22%	62%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	86%	63%	23%	64%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2021					
	2019	74%	57%	17%	60%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	70%	54%	16%	53%	17%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Stone Lakes Elementary utilized the iReady diagnostic to progress monitor ELA and Math. In Science Stone Lakes Elementary utilized the PMAs.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29%	47%	61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	39%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	8%	0%
	English Language Learners	6%	38%	60%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26%	48%	61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	42%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	15%	8%
	English Language Learners	13%	56%	53%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28%	53%	65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	36%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	14%	7%
	English Language Learners	13%	35%	47%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15%	37%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	18%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	14%	0%
	English Language Learners	27%	24%	53%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32%	41%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19%	22%	41%
	Students With Disabilities	4%	7%	7%
	English Language Learners	14%	17%	41%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9%	22%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8%	15%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	7%	7%
	English Language Learners	4%	14%	28%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32%	46%	59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	31%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	11%	11%
	English Language Learners	14%	36%	41%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18%	34%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	22%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	6%	29%
	English Language Learners	23%	32%	67%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32%	46%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	17%	26%
	Students With Disabilities	9%	9%	9%
	English Language Learners	22%	22%	17%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24%	42%	65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5%	39%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	9%	9%
	English Language Learners	13%	26%	48%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	71%	76%	76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51%	54%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	27%	27%	27%
	English Language Learners	42%	52%	52%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	15	25	30	23	42	45	33				
ELL	58	88		60	81		71				
ASN	83	71		95	93		94				
BLK	71	47		69	65	70	56				
HSP	68	66	58	70	73	58	79				
WHT	80	72		86	72		90				
FRL	62	67	53	64	76	58	59				
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				

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
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	566
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	70

English Language Learners	
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	87
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	63
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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	79
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	63
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

After analyzing the data across grade levels and subgroups, it is evident that SWD are not making adequate progress compared to other subgroups.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data component that performed the lowest was the ELA proficiency for SWD. The ELA proficiency for SWD was 18%. This is a 12% decrease from the 2018-2019 school year.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing factors to this need for improvement were varied. We had a large percentage of our SWD who attended school virtually for at least half of the school year. A larger percentage of our SWD received services via the hybrid model which was not the most effective strategy.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data component that showed the most improvement was the ELA learning gains for the lowest 25%.

The ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% increased from 33% to 60% for the 2020-2021 school year.

In addition, our ESSA black subgroup increased from 40% to 63%. The most improved category for this subgroup was the math learning gains for the lowest 25%. The math lowest 25% learning gains for black students increased from 10% to 70% for the 2020-2021 school year.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors to this improvement were a targeted focus on providing support for the ESSA black subgroup. Support for students was targeted starting in January to support any unfinished learning based on i-Ready mid-year data. The support was provided by a resource teacher. SLES also offered Saturday tutoring that focused on the ESSA black group.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The district is providing support to focus on acceleration versus remediation. In addition, tutoring for the 2021-2022 school year will focus on acceleration.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The Minority Achievement Office will offer PD opportunities for teachers. The CRT and Interventionalist will also provide resources and guidance for teachers. In addition, the SLES PD calendar reserves the third Tuesday of each month to provide training opportunities for teachers and staff which will include PD on acceleration.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

The strategies will constantly be monitored through the year to determine if changes need to be made to maximize academic progress.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>The ELA proficiency for SWD decreased from 30% to 15% for the 2020-2021 school year. This was a 15% decrease. The math proficiency for SWD decreased from 28% to 23% for the 2020-2021 school year. This was a 5% decrease.</p> <p>However, the SWD data points for ELA learning gains, ELA learning gains lowest 25%, math learning gains, math learning gains lowest 25% and science all increased for the 2020-2021 school year.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>The ELA and math learning gains for SWD will both increase to 41% for the 2020-2021 school year.</p> <p>The following systems will be implemented or modified to monitor the outcome:</p>
Monitoring:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Implement monthly ESE professional development sessions to have a laser focus on SWD students and their academic achievement. *Implement monthly MTSS professional development sessions that focus on ESE students. *Monitor CRMs assessments to specifically monitor the progress of SWD.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrew Rollins (andronidus.rollins@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Implement the ESE support facilitation for our SWD vs pulling students from their classes. *Increase the progress monitoring of the identified subgroup with common assessments and FSA Mock assessments. *Review and enhance the MTSS monitoring and documentation process. This will include MTSS professional development opportunities for teachers. *Request district support to conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide actionable feedback. *Conduct monthly leadership meetings that focus on the progress of SWD.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Improving the progress monitoring for our ESE students will provide more frequent and accurate data related to each student. Research shows that a strong MTSS program and increased monitoring 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. Monthly data chats with individual teachers (focus on SWD).

Person Responsible Roberta Nyffeler (roberta.nyffeler@ocps.net)

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

Integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially and emotionally.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By strengthening our school's culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:

- *Create a culture of inclusiveness
- *Enhancing parent involvement with school related events
- *Increase parent opportunities to attend evening PD sessions (FSA, internet safety, SEL at home, etc.)

Measurable Outcomes Include:

Measurable Outcome:

- *Early Warning Systems indicator data
- *Alex Incident/SESIR data
- *Panorama survey data-Student Survey - School Climate, Sense of Belonging
- *Panorama survey data-Teachers and Staff - School Climate, School Leadership, Professional Learning About SEL
- *Panorama survey data-Family Members - Barriers to Engagement, School Climate
- *Culture & Climate Continuum data
- *DESSA data (elementary schools only)

Monitoring tools include the following:

Monitoring:

- *Culture & Climate Continuum data
- *Classroom Walkthrough trend data
- *Evaluative instructional and leadership practice observational data
- *Qualitative data from students, staff, and families
- *Data utilized from the Caring Schools Curriculum

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alison Morris (alison.morris@ocps.net)

Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning focused on implementing a school-wide SEL curriculum, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies and deliberate school supports for families.

Evidence-based Strategy:

Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of the Culture and Climate continuum, needs assessments, classroom observations, school environment observations and implementation surveys. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, staff needs and family needs.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building, including its families. To strengthen a culture of social and emotional learning with families, staff, and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement and change.

Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement**1. Integrating Aligned Instructional and SEL Strategies**

- *Identify student social and emotional learning needs to prepare for academic instruction
- *Determine cognitive and conative strategies that align with the standard
- *Interpret standards and student needs to intentionally integrate aligned instructional strategies

Person Responsible Andrew Rollins (andronidus.rollins@ocps.net)

2. Deliberate School SEL Supports for Families

*Identify strategies to support family engagement based on Panorama Family Members Survey - Barriers to Engagement that relates to strengthening communication, building community and creating connections such as:

**Strengthening Communication: Create and facilitate opportunities to welcome families and introduce key staff (back to school night, Open House, principal breakfast)

Develop a school-wide digital communication outreach plan to inform students and families of how they can

connect to the school events and resources

**Building Community: Establish a family resource center where families can access resources and information to support student and school success

**Create a welcoming environment where family culture and languages are recognized and respected (staff

greetings, office appeal): Host events, workshops and opportunities that are relational, connected to family interests and culture, and are linked to learning

**Creating Family Connections

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

3. Monitor, Measure, and Modify

*Evaluate the climate and culture for social and emotional learning to implement necessary responsive practices

*Implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning & leadership that uses cycles of professional learning.

*Evaluate the impact of cycles of professional learning on improvement efforts

*Monitor, measure, and modify the plan for continuous improvement in social and emotional learning & leadership using data-based instructional leadership to positively impact climate and culture.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Comparing the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state indicates that we are ranked #1 (very low) which is positive in the following categories:

***Property Incidents**

***Drug/Public Order Incidents**

***Total Reported Suspensions 2019-2020**

However, our "Violent Incidents" was ranked very high. The district has specific processes that must be utilized for violent incidents. Stone Lakes Elementary is an ESE center school and that is one variable attributed to the total. Regardless of a student's "uniqueness", all incidents must be reported.

This year, Stone Lakes Elementary is participating in the Caring Schools initiative. Caring School Community features strategies for understanding and customizing for context. This includes school-wide community building activities to help develop teacher knowledge about the cultural backgrounds and perspectives of students. Additionally, teacher manuals provide explicit guidance for customizing the program to meet the needs of students in a given context. Stone Lakes Elementary will monitor the impact that the Caring Schools Curriculum has on student behavior.

In addition, the Behavior Specialist will continue to work with targeted students as proactive measures at the beginning of the year to set a positive foundation for success.

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.

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 staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, 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 school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

This year Stone Lakes Elementary is participating in the Caring Schools initiative. Caring School Community features strategies for understanding and customizing for context. This includes school-wide community building activities to help develop teacher knowledge about the cultural backgrounds and perspectives of students. Additionally, teacher manuals provide explicit guidance for customizing the program to meet the needs of students in a given context.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Principal/ Assistant Principal - Create an environment that infuses SEL into every part of students' educational experience and monitor the implementation.

School Counselor - Supporting teachers with implementation of the SEL/Caring Schools curriculum.

SEL Team - Provide PD opportunities for the staff.

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				\$4,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	7200	590-Other Materials and Supplies	1771 - Stone Lakes Elementary	General Fund		\$4,000.00
			Notes: Write Score Assessments for 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
Total:						\$4,000.00