Lake Sybelia Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Sybelia Elementary

600 SANDSPUR RD, Maitland, FL 32751

https://lakesybeliaes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: John Dobbs

Start Date for this Principal: 6/13/2016

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (47%)
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

Lake Sybelia Elementary

600 SANDSPUR RD, Maitland, FL 32751

https://lakesybeliaes.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 PK-5	No	85%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

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 an enriching and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dobbs, John	Principal	Supports grade levels 3rd - 5th, PTA Board, School Advisory Council, Grade Level Team Leaders, Car Riders
Adamson, Chenita	Assistant Principal	Supports grade levels kindergarten - 2nd, Bus Riders, Lunchroom, Paraprofessional Duties
Sheldon, Ann	Instructional Coach	Coaching of the classroom teacher in instructional practice.
Noonan, Rachael	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Testing Coordinator, Curriculum Support, MTSS Coordinator, ESE Support
Ickes, Stephanie	School Counselor	Counseling, Social-Emotional Learning, Threat Assessment

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/13/2016, John Dobbs

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.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

430

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

8

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

9

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	7	72	76	86	64	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	383
Attendance below 90 percent	2	23	24	26	14	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	1	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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

Friday 6/25/2021

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	25	82	70	71	80	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	397
Attendance below 90 percent	10	20	9	11	23	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	0	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	25	82	70	71	80	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	397
Attendance below 90 percent	10	20	9	11	23	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	0	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
Retained Students: Current Year	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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				64%	57%	57%	66%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	58%	58%	52%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	52%	53%	29%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				68%	63%	63%	69%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				61%	61%	62%	62%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	48%	51%	28%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				48%	56%	53%	56%	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	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	70%	57%	13%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	67%	62%	5%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	84%	63%	21%	64%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready - All Grade Levels

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21	31	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	26	28
	Students With Disabilities	11	17	10
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14	24	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	21	19
	Students With Disabilities	0	22	10
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	15	26	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	16	27
	Students With Disabilities	11	17	28
	English Language Learners	43	14	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6	24	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	5	14
	Students With Disabilities	6	6	11
	English Language Learners	14	0	13

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17	22	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	15	24
	Students With Disabilities	0	4	12
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2	7	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	2	8
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	14

Grade 4			
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**

	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16	20	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	9	13
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	12
	English Language Learners	9	13	38
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	4	21	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	12	19
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	13
	English Language Learners	0	13	21

Grade 5			

	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14	17	26
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	18	14
	Students With Disabilities	0	9	0
	English Language Learners	25	18	40
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	9	15	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	5	24
	Students With Disabilities	0	5	10
	English Language Learners	18	27	23
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Science	All Students	73	64	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	60	49	53
	Students With Disabilities	47	42	47
	English Language Learners	64	64	70

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	13	35		29	35		40				
ELL	40			50							
BLK	40	29		40	18		44				
HSP	39	40		46	53		71				
WHT	65	74		73	68		75				
FRL	34	40	18	35	40	27	46				

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	24	34	29	41	48	29	19				
ELL	61	63		68	68	40					
BLK	45	53	27	47	53	38	27				
HSP	59	55	43	64	53	25	50				
WHT	75	54		82	69		63				
FRL	50	54	34	55	53	34	37				

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	18	27	23	32	41	33					
ELL	63	54		60	21						
BLK	48	38	20	49	50	23	40				
HSP	62	54		69	57	27	36				
WHT	79	58	43	82	71	27	73				
FRL	54	45	22	60	58	29	39				

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	89%

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	50
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	
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	71
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	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

The most glaring issue we continue to face is with the learning gains for our bottom 25% of students in Reading and Math. We had made progress during the previous FSA with these groups only to regress some during the past year. Clearly, the shift to virtual learning had challenges that are evident in our data. The Students with Disabilities (SWD) make up a large percentage of the bottom 25% sub-group. This group is the main outlier on our ESSA data and area that needs ongoing support.

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

This data shows gains for our bottom 25% of students, but clearly is not the level we aspire to achieve for these students. Looking at the overall assessment data this is a clear weakness for our school. Based on this data, science is the other area that needs focus due to a drop of 7% from the prior administration.

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

This past year was a year of continual shifts of students and teachers within a variety of teaching and learning environments. The instability along with the learning curve of the utilization of technology clearly had an impact on student outcomes during the year. We will provide students only face-to-face instruction this year with a focus on building Social Emotional Learning and collaboration. We will look for ways to fill in learning gaps due to the learning loss in the previous year.

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

Most definitely the fifth grade Science score showed the greatest improvement. We increased the achievement on level by 19% from the prior administration of the assessment. Fifth Grade Achievement level increased in reading 7%, math 17%, and learning gains in math by 15%.

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

The greatest factor in this achievement was the dedication of the grade level team during the most difficult year I can remember. The innovatively approached instruction using technology in an effective way. We developed ways for students to collaborate online to increase motivation and achievement.

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

We will provide acceleration during the after-school tutoring program to pre-teach standards. We will utilize the interventionist position to push into classrooms in all grade levels for instructional support in reading and math. We have created a committee of teachers that are utilizing and supporting other teachers in the implementation of high-engagement lessons. We will begin to provide small group intervention support for math in all grade levels.

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.

We will provide teachers training on the new reading series Wonders in grades K-2. We will also work to familiarize teachers with the BEST Standards for Reading and Math in these grade levels. We will provide teachers with support and structured time for small group intervention in math. We will provide teachers with monthly planning days throughout the school year to focus their instructional efforts.

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

We will utilize the interventionist position to push into classrooms in all grade levels for instructional support in reading and math for this year and next. We will begin the implementation of the Wonders Reading series with the expansion next year to all grade levels. We will support teachers with the implementation of the BEST Standards in the primary grades this year and expand to the upper grades next year and beyond.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Currently, Lake Sybelia's Florida Standards Assessment results show that only 36% of the lowest 25% in English Language Arts made a learning gain and 36% of the lowest 25% made a learning gain in Math. Based on this data we are not effectively meeting the needs of our students that struggle the most. The largest percentage of this group are Students With Disabilities which is our area of focus for the Every Student Succeeds Act.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase teachers' knowledge of implementing small group instruction in math and understanding and implementation of the BEST Standards, learning gains in the lowest 25% in English Language Arts will increase from 36% to 40%, proficiency in Math will increase from 36% to 40% on the Florida Standards Assessment.
Monitoring:	We will monitor the progression of the bottom 25% of students in Reading and Math utilizing the results from the i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment administered three times during the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	John Dobbs (john.dobbs@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	During school-based PLCs, we will provide ongoing training throughout the year related to small group instruction in math. We will support teachers' implementation of BEST Standards and the new Reading Series. The Administrative Team will monitor for implementation through classroom walkthroughs and observations. The Administrative Team will also monitor the i-Ready Assessment Data throughout the year to monitor progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Community (PLC) An ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve. This is a research-based strategy for improving student outcomes. See: http://www.allthingsplc.info/about

Action Steps to Implement

We will provide training for teachers regarding the new district resources to support small group Math instruction that targets Priority Standards and quality Math center activities that will allow students that are not in a small group to continue to learn.

Person Responsible	Ann Sheldon (ann.sheldon@ocps.net)

We will utilize the Reflex Math program during small group instruction for supporting math fact fluency in Second-grade through Fifth-grade classes to create appropriate Math Fact Fluency along with an incentive program to support the effort.

Person Responsible	John Dobbs (john.dobbs@ocps.net)

Teachers at all grade levels will be provided an Interventions Notebook in which to monitor the effectiveness of the intervention supports put in place for students in our bottom 25% in Reading and Math. Members of the administrative team assigned to their grade level will monitor these notebooks weekly.

Person Responsible	Rachael Noonan (rachael.noonan@ocps.net)

We will monitor student data in reading and math to determine areas of need for re-teaching and we will work with grade teams to develop re-teach strategies for students deficient that are on targeted standards.

Person Responsible John Dobbs (john.dobbs@ocps.net)

We will organize an After School Tutoring Program for Reading and Math utilizing Acceleration Strategies and funded from ESSER.

Person Responsible Chenita Adamson (chenita.adamson@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our Panorama Survey Data We believe that that students often do not have the self-management skills to cope with conflict, by supporting students in building these skills overall student academic outcomes will improve.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on Panorama Survey we will increase the percentage of students that perceive others as being respectful to others by 5% to 54% on Panorama Survey.
Monitoring:	We will review data gathered from students through the Student Roundtables, observations within the class meetings, discipline data to determine progress related to our targeted outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Ickes (stephanie.ickes@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students make additions and deletions to revise previous knowledge and thinking processes in order to deepen understanding. By using social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making, students have an awareness of the power of interpretations and take various perspectives.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students' revision of knowledge enhances the development of declarative knowledge, allowing students to add to and sharpen their knowledge base. By attending to the conative needs of students in connection with this cognitive process, teachers help to support student facilitation of responsible decision-making.

Action Steps to Implement

We have selected to use a Social Emotional Learning program Second Step that will allow us to establish a consistent approach with students grade Kindergarten to Fifth. We will provide teachers with the training necessary for successful implementation.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Ickes (stephanie.ickes@ocps.net)

We will set expectations for teachers to implement a scheduled class meeting in an effort to build a classroom community and allow us to monitor implementation at those learning activities.

Person Responsible	Chenita Adamson (chenita.adamson@ocps.net)

We will monitor I-Ready data for our students to monitor the academic increase that will occur by creating a more inclusive learning environment.

Person Responsible	John Dobbs (john.dobbs@ocps.net)

We will provide teachers with training and support for implementing the Second Step SEL Program and monitor implementation during targeted walkthroughs.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Ickes (stephanie.ickes@ocps.net)

We will create a more Culturally Responsive school environment by adding literature to classroom environments that support this effort and place positive messages throughout our school that represents the diverse cultures we serve.

**Person
Responsible**   John Dobbs (john.dobbs@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that (50% or more) 47% of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA). (https://info.fldoe.org/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-9271/dps-2021-146a.pdf)
Measurable Outcome:	The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase of at least 5 percentage points from 47% to 52%.
Monitoring:	We will monitor the area of focus using data from i-Ready Diagnostic Assessments and i-Ready Growth Monitoring Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	John Dobbs (john.dobbs@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. This instructional practice has a moderate level of evidence.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This selected instructional practice has a moderate level of evidence, as noted in this link for the IES Guide for Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding. (https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/wwc_foundationalreading_040717.pdf#page=28)

Action Steps to Implement

We will provide teachers in grades K-2 with training and support of the implementation of BEST Standards and utilizing the Wonders Reading Program during Professional Learning Communities Meetings and after-school training.

Person Responsible	Ann Sheldon (ann.sheldon@ocps.net)

Teachers at all grade levels will be provided an Interventions Notebook in which to monitor the effectiveness of the intervention supports put in place for students in our bottom 25% in Reading. Members of the administrative team assigned to their grade level will monitor these notebooks weekly.

Person Responsible	Rachael Noonan (rachael.noonan@ocps.net)

We will provide After-School Tutoring for students that are struggling with Reading on a weekly basis. We will monitor the progression of these targeted groups using i-Ready Data and usage.

Person Responsible	John Dobbs (john.dobbs@ocps.net)

Ensure the 90-minute reading block contains statutory requirements. 6 components of reading (as noted in Florida's Formula for success). Daily inclusion of on-level whole group instruction, and differentiated small group instruction

Person Responsible	Chenita Adamson (chenita.adamson@ocps.net)

MTSS Problem Solving Teams meet regularly to ensure:
1. Students are appropriately identified.
2. Students are matched to appropriate interventions and intensity.
3. Data analysis is routinely part of the process, and adjustments are made to interventions based on the MTSS Problem Solving Team's findings.

Person Responsible   Rachael Noonan (rachael.noonan@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

The primary area of concern based on the discipline data from the previous school year indicates that we have a high incident rate of violent incidents at our school. This has to take primary focus regarding improving our school environment. We believe that our initiatives regarding Social Emotional Learning will play a key role in bringing this ratio down during the coming school year. We will utilize the Sanford Harmony Program to support class-meeting structures in classrooms to build student connectivity. We will also implement a program called Second Step this year in support of this initiative. We will bring back ABC's for success review on the morning news. We formulate a committee and make a major initiative to celebrate Kindness Week. We will present Child Safety Matters to all grade levels throughout the year.

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.

Lake Sybelia is a community of learners. As a school, we celebrate our differences by strategically reaching out to ensure all cultures are included in school-wide events. Our Deaf/Hard of Hearing culture is supported with interpreters on the morning news, in all areas of the school that students visit (i.e. cafeteria, art room, library, self-contained classrooms, and during specials events such as assemblies. The multi-cultural student
population is represented through the Multi-Lingual Parent Leadership Council, which serves as a liaison for support between the school and the District. Students, staff, and parents celebrate multi-cultural awareness through school-wide events and activities. Teachers build community within their classrooms through morning meetings and community-building activities. Parents are welcome in classrooms and are encouraged to volunteer and share cultural beliefs and traditions. We also actively seek involvement from all stakeholder subgroups in our School Advisory Council. These stakeholders play a crucial role in the development of our focus for the coming school year.

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

Students - Work collaboratively together during learning and participate actively during Social Emotional Learning lessons.

Parents - Support their child's learning at home and reinforcing social skills. Participating in school-based activities and committees to support a positive environment.

Teachers - Provide Social Emotional Learning lessons and support class meetings to allow students to interact regarding non-academic issues. Work to provide collaborative opportunities for learning for students.

Administration - Create a welcoming environment as we greet every student into the school each day. Support the emotional needs of students, parents, and staff. Support and monitor Social Emotional Learning lessons and support class meetings.