

Orange County Public Schools

Ivey Lane Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 27 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 28 |

Ivey Lane Elementary

209 SILVERTON ST, Orlando, FL 32811

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

Demographics

Principal: Gorsha Galbraith

Start Date for this Principal: 11/1/2017

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 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 Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: F (30%) 2016-17: B (58%) |
| 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 | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 28 |

Ivey Lane Elementary

209 SILVERTON ST, Orlando, FL 32811

<https://iveylaneees.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 | Yes | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 98% |

School Grades History

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

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 our families and communities, we will create enriching and diverse pathways that 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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Danner, Samuel | Principal | Mr. Danner is one of the instructional leaders on campus. He provides the school-based leadership required to sustain a focus of improving instruction for the purpose of increasing achievement of all students in a safe learning environment while ensuring the orderly and efficient operation of the school. Mr. Danner monitors the instructional delivery of the standards. He facilitates instructional rounds and provides teachers with actionable feedback to enhance their professional practices. |
| Anderson, Adriene | Assistant Principal | Mrs. Anderson is one of the instructional leaders on campus. Along with the principal she monitors the instructional delivery of the standards. Mrs. Anderson facilitates instructional rounds and provides teachers with actionable feedback to enhance their professional practices. The assistant principal partners with the principal to implement systems and structures that yield a strong learning environment. She has the responsibility of analyzing common assessment data to make timely instructional decisions that impact student achievement. Mrs. Anderson is also responsible for monitoring the discipline process to ensure a positive school climate and safe working environment. |
| McNamee, Stephanie | Instructional Coach | Mrs. McNamee serves as the instructional coach. She supports the administrative team in leading professional development in the content area of science. She utilizes the coaching cycle to support teachers in need of Tier II and Tier III support. She also provides support to teachers in developing best practices for delivering standard-based instruction. Mrs. McNamee provides targeted instruction to students identified as performing below grade level on summative and formative assessments. In her other role, she serves as the testing coordinator, she oversees the organization and administration of school-based, district level and state standardized testing. |
| McKinney, Roderick | Math Coach | Mr. McKinney serves as the math instructional coach. As the academic coach, he facilitates ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build teacher capacity. Equally important, he also provides targeted instruction to students identified as performing below grade level on summative and formative assessments. |
| Augustine, Nikisha | Staffing Specialist | Ms. Augustine serves as the staffing specialist. She works and collaborates with teachers to establish individual learning plans and 504 plans for students that have been identified based upon the MTSS process. Additionally, she oversees the school wide MTSS process by ensuring teachers are collecting academic data with fidelity and providing the appropriate intervention support for students in need of Tier II or Tier III support. |
| Forsythe, Marcia | School Counselor | Ms. Forsythe provides a comprehensive curriculum focused on academic, as well as, social and emotional learning for all students. She also |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|----------------|---|
| | | supports the administrative team by providing professional development for teachers in the area of Social Emotional Learning. She incorporates character education, prevention and intervention services to meet the diverse needs of the student body. |
| Cunningham, Latoya | Other | Ms. Cunningham serves as the math interventionist. She provides targeted instruction to students identified as performing below grade level on summative and formative assessments. She also provides support to teachers in developing best practices for delivering standard-based instruction. |
| Jackson, Candace | Reading Coach | Ms. Jackson serves as the reading instructional coach. As the academic coach, she facilitates ongoing, job-embedded professional development to build teacher capacity. Equally important, she also provides targeted instruction to students identified as performing below grade level on summative and formative assessments. |
| Axson, Lestor | Dean | Mr. Axson serves as the school dean. He assists with the school-wide implementation CHAMPS at Ivey Lane Elementary. Mr. Axson, along with teachers and staff, incentivize the student body with noble bucks, which are used to purchase desired, age appropriate items from the Knight store. He provides teachers and support personnel with professional development on classroom management, restorative practices, and effective strategies to aide students with successful academic, personal and social development. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 11/1/2017, Gorsha Galbraith

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

Total number of students enrolled at the school

280

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

3

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

8

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 | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/12/2021

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 | 18 | 55 | 55 | 59 | 64 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 301 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 14 | 8 | 11 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |

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 | 8 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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 | 18 | 55 | 55 | 59 | 64 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 301 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 14 | 8 | 11 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |

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 | 8 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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 | | | | 31% | 57% | 57% | 29% | 56% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 59% | 58% | 58% | 22% | 55% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 62% | 52% | 53% | 25% | 48% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 54% | 63% | 63% | 44% | 63% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 70% | 61% | 62% | 36% | 57% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 55% | 48% | 51% | 22% | 46% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 37% | 56% | 53% | 33% | 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 | 23% | 55% | -32% | 58% | -35% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 57% | -17% | 58% | -18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -23% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 23% | 54% | -31% | 56% | -33% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -40% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 62% | -10% | 62% | -10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 63% | -1% | 64% | -2% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | -52% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 41% | 57% | -16% | 60% | -19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 35% | 54% | -19% | 53% | -18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool that was used to compile the data below is the i-Ready Diagnostic and PMA.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 35% | 47% | 52% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 30% | 36% | 50% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | English Language Learners | 11% | 44% | 56% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 12% | 24% | 40% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 11% | 20% | 39% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 100% | 100% |
| | English Language Learners | 11% | 20% | 30% |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 14% | 24% | 30% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 7% | 19% | 28% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 14% | 14% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 4% | 8% | 15% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 5% | 7% | 14% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | | | | |
| Grade 3 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 34% | 43% | 59% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 28% | 38% | 57% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 25% | 50% |
| | English Language Learners | 25% | 38% | 38% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 6% | 13% | 38% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 4% | 11% | 36% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 25% | 25% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 25% |
| | | | | |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 7% | 16% | 24% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 6% | 15% | 22% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 10% | 10% |
| | English Language Learners | 10% | 10% | 20% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 6% | 18% | 41% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 7% | 17% | 39% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 10% | 0% | 20% |
| | English Language Learners | 10% | 30% | 60% |
| | | | | |
| Grade 5 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 12% | 18% | 30% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 7% | 14% | 33% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 0% | 17% |
| | English Language Learners | 10% | 10% | 40% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 14% | 26% | 42% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 14% | 29% | 45% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17% | 17% | 33% |
| | English Language Learners | 14% | 29% | 70% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 30% | 26% | 39% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 30% | 31% | 36% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25% | 50% | 25% |
| | English Language Learners | 50% | 50% | 56% |
| | | | | |

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 | 11 | | | 21 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 40 | 64 | | 52 | 64 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 55 | 73 | 46 | 36 | 36 | 38 | | | | |
| HSP | 48 | | | 43 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 32 | 61 | 73 | 47 | 45 | 40 | 48 | | | | |
| 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 | 13 | 62 | 85 | 28 | 64 | 62 | 13 | | | | |
| ELL | 33 | 63 | | 89 | 93 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 58 | 57 | 52 | 68 | 52 | 31 | | | | |
| HSP | 28 | 57 | | 74 | 89 | | 42 | | | | |
| FRL | 29 | 56 | 60 | 53 | 71 | 61 | 34 | | | | |
| 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 | 7 | 24 | | 11 | 19 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 14 | 20 | | 31 | 25 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | 20 | 19 | 46 | 38 | 19 | 29 | | | | |
| HSP | 12 | 22 | | 29 | 26 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 29 | 22 | 25 | 44 | 36 | 22 | 33 | | | | |

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 | 47 |
| 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 | 46 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 377 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 16 |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 44 |
| 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 | 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 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 | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 49 |
| 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?

Overall, all grade levels showed growth in i-Ready Beginning of Year (BOY) to End of Year (EOY) in ELA. In math, all grade levels showed growth from BOY to EOY except the second grade students.

All of the grade levels in the subgroup of Students with Disabilities performed higher from the BOY to the EOY than the English Language Learners in ELA. An additional trend observed includes the English Language Learners who made less progress in mathematics from BOY to EOY when compared to the Students with Disabilities subgroup in all five grade levels.

The i-Ready Math EOY indicated that an average of 37% of the ELL students were proficient. The ELL students are growing however; the second grade ELL students scored zero percent proficient on the i-Ready EOY.

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

The i-Ready BOY standard view indicated four percent of the second grade students were proficient or higher on the diagnostic assessment. On the EOY 15% of the second grade students scored at proficiency or higher on the end-of-year assessment. This data shows a three percent decrease from the Middle of the Year (MOY) diagnostic.

The i-Ready ELA BOY standard view indicated 14% of the second-grade students were proficient or higher on the diagnostic assessment. On the EOY 30% of the second grade students scored at the proficient level or higher.

The 2018-2019 FSA ELA data components show that 23% of the third graders were proficient in ELA. This was a 22% decrease from the previous school year.

According to the progress monitoring data and 2019 state assessments, second grade is the area that has the greatest need for improvement ELA and math.

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

The factors that contributed to this need for improvement was lack of monitoring for standards-based instruction and for effective instructional delivery in the primary grades. The students were not able to consistently receive standards-based instruction and effective instructional delivery due to the inconsistency of common planning.

The new actions needed to address this need for improvement would be to hold weekly Professional Learning Communities that have an intense focus on standards-based instruction and effective instructional delivery strategies in ELA and math. Additionally, the administration team will conduct bi-weekly data meetings to review student data to determine if the transfer of planning is transferring in the instructional delivery of the teachers.

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

The 2018-2019 FSA data components that showed the most improvement were math overall learning gains and students in lowest 25th percentile for ELA. This data showed a 34% increase in math overall learning gains and a 37% increase in the lowest 25th percentile students for ELA.

The i-Ready ELA BOY standard view indicated 34% of the 3rd grade students scored at proficient or higher on the diagnostic assessment. Additionally, 59% of the 3rd grade students scored at proficient or higher on the EOY assessment. This was a 25% increase from the beginning of the year until the end of the year.

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

The contributing factors for this improvement were the implementation of differentiated instruction that targeted students and their specific deficiencies. In addition to this, the school-based and district coaches, senior administrators, and tutors pulled-out targeted students to remediate and reteach standards in smaller group settings during the ELA and math blocks. In addition to this, new actions that were taken were content coaches provided teachers with professional developments on differentiated instruction, guided reading, and the disaggregation of data. These professional developments allowed teachers to make instructional decisions for the targeted groups in which they were supporting.

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

Strategies that will be implemented to accelerate learning are as follows:

Collaborative groups will be utilized for student to student work. These groups will complete rigorous standards-based tasks and every person in the group will have a role of contributing to the overall group success. Students will be able to further develop social-emotional skills during this time.

Scaffolding will occur intentionally and teachers will start a lesson with less complex text to establish a solid foundation of understanding before transitioning to a more complex text. This allows students to be successful with text that may have been inaccessible without that support. Combining scaffolds and grade level skills, rather than focusing on isolated skills, provides opportunities for students to use familiar, mastered skills in conjunction with newly acquired ones to achieve new levels of understanding.

Differentiating instruction will occur to tailor the instruction based on strengths and areas of growth for each student. The curriculum will be tailored to deliberately and intentionally meet individual learners'

specific needs over a prescribed period. Rather than approaching instruction from a deficit model, we will focus on student strengths, simultaneously provide compensatory strategies and additional instruction to address gaps in learning and needed areas of growth.

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.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning we will provide professional development opportunities with an intense focus on collaborative structures implementation. We will also continue to provide professional learning opportunities on differentiated instruction.

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

Ivey Lane Elementary will be providing tutoring support for the Tier II and Tier III students based on progress monitoring data. We will also have academic services that will provide tutoring through an acceleration model for students who are performing on or above grade level. Along with support for the students, we will also provide differentiated and tiered coaching support to teachers based on classroom data and observational trends. We will continue to focus on monitoring the data throughout the school year and create action steps that will continue to improve student achievement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | <p>Ivey Lane Elementary will build teacher capacity in instructional practices specifically relating to differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all learners for the 2021-2022 school year. Differentiating instruction is a teaching method that involves tailoring instruction to individual students' needs.</p> <p>This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need because it focuses on the needs of individual students. Ivey Lane Elementary students in the lowest 30% in ELA and Math will increase as a result of implementing effective differentiated instruction based upon 2018-2019 FSA data and by focusing on the effective implementation of the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) framework.</p> <p>After analyzing individual student data, students need to understand the prerequisite skills necessary to understand the grade level ELA and Math standards. Additionally, students with specific needs that affect their learning need to be identified and given appropriate interventions to support their learning and growth towards proficiency.</p> <p>The ELA lowest 25% quartile learning gains for the 2018-2019 FSA data is 62%. The Math lowest 25% quartile learning gains for the 2018-2019 FSA data is 55%.</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: | <p>For the 2021-2022 school year, students at Ivey Lane Elementary School in the lowest 25% quartile will show learning gains of 68% in ELA. This will show an overall increase of six percent.</p> <p>For the 2021-2022 school year, students at Ivey Lane Elementary School in the lowest 25% quartile will show learning gains of 60% in math. This will show an overall increase of five percent.</p> |
| Monitoring: Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | <p>The Area of Focus will be monitored by the school-based leadership team and district support. Each person on the leadership team will be assigned students that fall within the lowest 25% and will be responsible for tracking the data and monitoring the support that students are receiving in differentiated groups.</p> <p>Adriene Anderson (adriene.anderson@ocps.net)</p> |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Students will be placed in differentiated instructional groupings based upon 2020-2021 i-Ready End of the year diagnostic and the 2020-21 FSA data. The team will develop a walkthrough schedule to observe all teachers with an emphasis on teachers receiving Tier II and Tier III support. The school-based leadership team and district support will monitor teachers' instructional practices. The teams will calibrate and quantify their observational findings. The actionable feedback will be shared during the weekly PLCs and during school-based meetings.</p> <p>Professional development on differentiated instruction, guided reading instruction, disaggregation, and use of student data will be provided. Professional development will also be provided on the MTSS framework. MTSS meetings will be held every 4-6 weeks to review, modify and monitor the plans created for each student.</p> |

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Teachers have more impact on student achievement in small groups, because they are able to focus on the specific need of the targeted student. Professional development on differentiated instruction, disaggregation, and use of student data and guided reading instruction are areas of concern due to the changing needs of the students and the lack of fidelity in instruction. Students in the lowest 25% need carefully planned intervention in ELA and math.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration will tier teachers based upon data from classroom observations of instruction.
2. Content coaches will hold weekly PLCs to discuss ELA and math standards and small group plans.
3. Administration will hold bi-weekly data meetings to discuss student data and create plans for instruction for the regrouping of students.
4. Content coaches will provide professional developments on differentiated instruction, the MTSS process, guided reading, and disaggregation and use of data.
5. Teachers will implement lesson plans with consistency and fidelity.
6. MTSS meetings will be held every 4 to 6 weeks and monitored by the assistant principal.
7. Coaches will implement the coaching cycle as needed for teachers.
8. Administrators will observe interventions and provide teachers, coaches, and support staff with actionable feedback.

Person

Responsible Adriene Anderson (adriene.anderson@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Ivey Lane Elementary student achievement will increase in all content areas as a result of strategic small group differentiated instruction for the 2021-2022 school year. Small group instruction allows teachers and support staff to provide direct intimate, differentiated, and targeted standards-based instruction to increase the overall student achievement and learning gains for both ELA and math content areas.

This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need because it focuses on the needs of individual students. Teachers and interventionists need to be able to understand the framework of small group and the proper delivery of standards based instruction in ELA, Math, and Science. Teachers and interventionists will work in small groups in order to accelerate proficient students and work with all students on their deficiencies.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The overall school ELA achievement for the 2018-2019 FSA data is 31%. Based on 2018-2019 FSA Reading scores third grade had 23% of students score a level 3 or higher, fourth grade had 40% of students score a level 3 or higher, and fifth grade had 23% of students score a level 3 or higher.

The overall school math achievement for the 2018-2019 FSA data is 54%. Based on the 2018-2019 FSA math scores, third grade had 52% of students' score a level 3 or higher, fourth grade had 62% of students' score a level 3 or higher, and fifth grade had 41% of students' score a level 3 or higher.

The i-Ready ELA EOY indicated that, 38% of third, fourth, and fifth grade students were proficient in math.

The i-Ready math EOY indicated that, 38% of third, fourth, and fifth grade students were proficient in math.

For the 2021-2022 school year, students at Ivey Lane Elementary School will show an overall proficiency rate of 41% in ELA on the Florida Standards Assessment. This will show an overall increase of 10%.

Measurable Outcome:

For the 2021-2022 school year, students at Ivey Lane Elementary School will show an overall proficiency rate of 58% in math on the Florida Standards Assessment. This will show an overall increase of 6%.

Monitoring:

Teachers and interventionists will participate in weekly PLCs that focus on the Florida standards in ELA, math and science and effective delivery of these standards. Professional development on building students' ability to engage in complex tasks and analyzing their own thinking will be given, and these strategies will be monitored through classroom walk throughs. Monitoring of student work samples, classroom assessment data, i-Ready data, and small group instruction will be conducted by coaches and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samuel Danner (samuel.danner@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers and interventionists will participate in weekly PLCs that focus on the Florida standards in ELA, math and science and will add small group engagement and collaborative structures to their plans. Effective use of engagement strategies and collaborative structures will increase student achievement in their small group lessons.

| | |
|---|--|
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Concentrating on high yield strategies, increasing student engagement, and having a clear understanding of the Florida standards when teaching small groups of students will enhance students' understanding of content, thereby increasing student achievement. Administrators will monitor using classroom walkthroughs that focus on implementation of instruction with consistency and fidelity. |
|---|--|

Action Steps to Implement

1. We will provide professional development on the deconstruction of the LAFS, MAFS and NGSS Science standards.
2. We will provide professional development on specific areas of Marzano's high yield strategies with a focus on engagement.
3. We will provide professional development on effective delivery of small group instruction in reading, math and science.
4. Our coaches will implement the coaching cycle as needed for teachers using classroom observation and teacher data.
5. Teachers, coaches and administrators will participate in weekly PLC/Data meetings.
6. Classroom walkthroughs and actionable feedback from administrators and coaches will be given to teachers weekly.

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Person Responsible | Samuel Danner (samuel.danner@ocps.net) |
|---------------------------|--|

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | <p>This Area of Focus is connected to the culture and environment of the school specifically related to social and emotional learning. It is important to create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students. It is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Ivey Lane Elementary students will develop social-emotional skills in rigorous focused conative learning that will impact academic success in a variety of settings.</p> <p>This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need because it focuses on social and emotional learning of the students. In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, Ivey Lane Elementary will engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success.</p> <p>Based on the Early Warning Systems indicator data students with two or more indicators is currently at 10% of our student population for the 2020-2021 school year.</p> <p>Based on the Early Warning Systems indicator data 94 students scored at a level 1 on the statewide assessment.</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: | <p>Improvement in Early Warning Systems indicator data - Students with two or more indicators is currently at 10% of our student population for the 2020-2021 school year. By the end of the 2021-2022 school year that number will decrease to seven percent.</p> |
| Monitoring: | <p>The school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. Additionally, we will be monitoring the implementation of the strategies modeled and usage of the resources provided and will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | <p>Samuel Danner (samuel.danner@ocps.net)</p> |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>The school based leadership team along with the Social Emotional Learning team will continue to provide professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data.</p> <p>Each classroom will work to implement class meetings to build relationships with students and develop a positive classroom community which contributes to the overall development of a positive culture school wide.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Professional development on SEL, teaching students conative skills, and SMART goals are areas that are beneficial to the students' long term comprehension of academic content. Infusing SEL components into the daily academic language and activities will reduce the amount of students scoring at a level 1 by 25%.</p> |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration will provide professional development on Marzano's conative skills and their effect on instruction.
2. Administration will provide professional development on SMART goals during student data chats.
3. The school-based guidance counselor will provide weekly SEL lessons for use in the classroom.
4. The school-based guidance counselor will pull targeted students for small group SEL lessons.
5. The weekly PLCs will include collaborating on how to incorporate SEL learning in each lesson.

6. Administrators and coaches will monitor for implementation through classroom walkthroughs, weekly PLC discussions and give actionable feedback.

Person
Responsible Marcia Forsythe (47914@ocps.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Ivey Lane Elementary will increase proficiency and narrow the achievement gap in ELA as a result of teachers consistently implementing standards-based instruction with the use of effective monitoring of student progress towards mastery and the implementation of authentic engagement strategies. Based on the school-wide data, ELA proficiency is an area of difficulty. Literacy strategies can be infused in all content areas, so it is imperative for teachers to implement best practices when planning standards-based lessons.

This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need because Ivey Lane data demonstrates that there is a continual need for ensuring the alignment and monitoring for both mastery of standards (proficiency levels) and continued growth (learning gains) in ELA.

The overall school ELA achievement for the 2018-2019 FSA data is 31%. Based on 2018-2019 FSA Reading scores third grade had 23% of students score a level 3 or higher, fourth grade had 40% of students score a level 3 or higher, and fifth grade had 23% of students score a level 3 or higher. The ELA overall learning gains for the 2018-2019 FSA data was 62%. The ELA overall learning gains for the 2018-2019 FSA data was 59%.

In order to improve the school grade, the following measurable outcomes will be achieved:

Measurable Outcome:

For the 2021-2022 school year, students at Ivey Lane Elementary School will show an overall proficiency rate of 41% in ELA on the Florida Standards Assessment. This will show an overall increase of 10%.

For the 2021-2022 school year, students at Ivey Lane Elementary School in the lowest quartile will show learning gains of 68% in ELA. This will show an overall increase of six percent.

Monitoring:

Through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), grade-level teams will meet three days a week with leadership team members to develop and plan for instruction using and analyzing data from both i-Ready and common unit assessments. Through this planning process, teams will work to target skills and strategies that will support the mastery of standards, as well as close achievement gaps as identified by the formative and summative assessments. Also, the writing process will be implemented in daily ELA lessons with monthly prompts used as formative assessments. Monitoring of student work samples, classroom assessment data, i-Ready data, and small group instruction will be conducted by coaches and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adriene Anderson (adriene.anderson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

A key focus will be on backwards planning, use of high yield strategies, small group differentiated instruction, and analysis of data to support the MTSS process. The use of these strategies will ensure that teachers are planning for high quality instruction that focuses on a defined Depth of Knowledge (DOK) level and outcome for learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Research-based "High Yield" strategies have been chosen to support our quest to increase scholars' achievement. These strategies have demonstrated that when used effectively, with a high level of fidelity, they will support scholar achievement. Differentiating instruction will improve scholar achievement by meeting all learners' needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop and implement flexible groupings. Implement daily small group instruction to provide opportunities for teachers to differentiate instructional strategies to close learning gaps, support engagement, and monitor progression of learning.

Increase our systematic approach to providing scaffolded supports (Differentiation/MTSS) to provide assistance to students so they can successfully complete tasks that they cannot yet do independently or with a high rate of success.

Teachers, coaches, and administrators will participate in weekly PLC/Data meetings.

Classroom walkthroughs and actionable feedback from administrators and coaches will be given to teachers weekly.

Person Responsible Adriene Anderson (adriene.anderson@ocps.net)

Coaches will implement the coaching cycle as needed for teachers using classroom observation and teacher data.

Person Responsible Candace Jackson (candace.jackson@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.

When looking at discipline data on the SafeSchoolsforAlex website, Ivey Lane Elementary is ranked "very high" for discipline incidents, ranking 1,277 out of 1395 elementary schools for safety. There were 10 violent incidents for the year. As a result of the implementation of social-emotional learning strategies, we will show a decrease of 40% 6 incidents per 100 students on the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org. We understand that students need to be taught alternative ways to express frustration and anger in a more socially acceptable manner rather than reacting with physical aggression. SEL strategies including class meetings, journaling, role playing and character building activities, together with consistent SEL lessons will build the social/emotional capacity of students. The school, as a whole, will continue to implement Positive Mindset strategies to encourage positive behaviors and attitudes in school.

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.

Through a distributive leadership model, Ivey Lane Elementary uses social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. We 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 our school, which includes a mental health designee, will attend the district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with teachers and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. The development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school culture.

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

The school based leadership team along with the Social Emotional Learning Team will use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic success with all students. Ivey Lane Elementary will plan and implement professional development to all staff strengthening the awareness and importance of Social Emotional Learning Leadership (SELL). Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. Teachers will continue to work in their classrooms to implement class meetings to build relationships with students and develop a positive classroom community which contributes to the overall development of a positive culture school wide.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|----------|--|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----|-------------|-------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | | | | | \$11,890.23 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 | |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 1421 - Ivey Lane Elementary | Title, I Part A | | \$11,890.23 | |
| | | | Notes: Acaletics Math Program | | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction | | | | | \$4,998.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 | |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 1421 - Ivey Lane Elementary | Title, I Part A | | \$4,998.00 | |
| | | | Notes: Performance Coach | | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | | | | | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | | | | | \$16,888.23 |