Seminole Springs Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Seminole Springs Elementary School

26200 W HUFF RD, Eustis, FL 32736

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

Demographics

Principal: Kyle Bracewell

Start Date for this Principal: 8/11/2021

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* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Lake County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Seminole Springs Elementary School

26200 W HUFF RD, Eustis, FL 32736

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	92%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	31%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Seminole Springs Elementary where all students LEAD and SUCCEED!

Succeed =
•Achieving academically and socially
•Follow The 7 Habits
•Set and reach goals

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create a collaborative learning community that ensures high levels of learning so all students can achieve excellence both academically and socially in order to become productive leaders in society.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hargroves, Maria	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Teacher Coaching Instructional Planning with teachers during Collaborative Planning sessions Model lessons Pull students for small group intervention Title 1 Contact Testing Coordinator After School Tutoring
Grable, Vicky	Staffing Specialist	School Staffing Specialist Assist in creating schedules for VE teachers and ESE Teacher's Assistant's to maximize student impact
Abston, Midge	Assistant Principal	Safety Contact Health Coordinator Student Discipline BTA Team Lead
Purdham, Patricia	Instructional Technology	Media Specialist and Technology Contact
Schaefer, Helena	School Counselor	Social Emotional Support on Campus One-on-One Counseling Small Group Counseling

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/11/2021, Kyle Bracewell

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

429

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	16	58	74	74	68	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	370
Attendance below 90 percent	3	13	25	21	15	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	1	3	12	12	26	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/11/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				63%	58%	57%	67%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	57%	58%	58%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	49%	53%	45%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				71%	60%	63%	69%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				56%	56%	62%	44%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	39%	51%	43%	41%	47%
Science Achievement				60%	54%	53%	68%	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	62%	60%	2%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	65%	60%	5%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	59%	-3%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	76%	62%	14%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	80%	61%	19%	64%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	57%	-6%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	57%	56%	1%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Math and Reading

Grade 1			
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	17	43	68
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	10	25	45
	English Language Learners	0	0	57
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	14	51	70
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	30	55
	English Language Learners	0	14	57

Grade 2			
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	27	49	61
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	21	29	43
	English Language Learners	0	43	43
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	17	44	73
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	14	36	57
	English Language Learners	14	29	57

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46	72	78
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	25	38	67
	English Language Learners	20	30	70
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13	44	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	8	17	NA
	English Language Learners	0	0	NA

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37	55	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	13	22	NA
	English Language Learners	25	75	NA
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16	44	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4	26	NA
	English Language Learners	0	50	NA

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27	39	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	11	11	NA
	English Language Learners	100	100	NA
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30	44	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	5	5	NA
	English Language Learners	0	100	NA
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	41	67		42	33	25	22				
ELL	44			47							
HSP	57	75		50	50		67				
WHT	60	60	62	69	34	23	56				
FRL	53	54	64	56	35		49				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	45	54		55	58	58	67				
ELL	50	58		50	42						
HSP	60	53		67	50	25	57				
MUL	50			50							
WHT	65	65	69	75	63	54	64				

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
FRL	59	53	55	65	49	37	50				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	42	57	40	46	48	35	75				
ELL	20			50							
HSP	63	67		61	37		45				
MUL	60			80							
WHT	68	57	38	71	47	42	70				
FRL	61	55	47	59	41	43	60				

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	52
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	419
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	48
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	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
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	52
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	53
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?

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on FSA ELA and Math results along with the i-Ready progress monitoring data from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section, instructional practice as it relates to standards-aligned instruction is one of our most critical area of focus. This area of focus was assigned as a critical area of need because the data showed gaps in proficiency across grade levels in both ELA and Math. Teachers will intentionally plan for and engage students in standards-aligned instruction with a focus on guided instruction as a strategy to transfer knowledge and responsibility for learning to students by scaffolding through questioning, prompting and cueing.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in ELA, Math, and Science proficiency. ELA Proficiency will increase from 59% to 62% Math Proficiency will increase from 64% to 67% Science Proficiency will increase from 59% to 62%
Monitoring:	Common Formative Assessment Classroom Learning Walks PLC Data Analysis (Question 3 and 4) iReady Data FSA Data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Work (workm@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will continue work as a Professional Learning Communities during grade level collaborative planning time with an intense focus on student learning and results. The four PLC questions will guide the learning and work within teacher teams as they plan for standards based instruction through establishing the purpose, authentic literacy experiences and delving into instructional best practices. This will be monitored through admin participation, classroom walkthroughs and on going progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Lake County Schools is committed to becoming a Professional Learning Community school district.

Action Steps to Implement

The Region 1 support team will conduct Instructional Reviews 2-3 times a year to provide feedback and support. Region 1 Program Specialist will visit every other Monday to provide ongoing support of classroom instruction and PLC implementation.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional staff will use ongoing formative assessments and progress monitoring data to inform intervention and enrichment activities to increase learning gains for all students. All students will participate in "walk to" intervention to best meet their instructional needs in both ELA and Math. If teachers use ongoing formative assessments and progress monitoring data to inform intervention and enrichment for all students, then students will receive timely feedback that will help move their understanding of essential learning targets forward.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in ELA and Math Learning Gains. ELA Learning Gains will increase from 64% to 67% ELA Learning Gains (LQ) will increase from 63% to 66% Math Learning Gains will increase from 38% to 55% Math Learning Gains (LQ) will increase from 19% to 55%
Monitoring:	The Area of Focus will be monitored by analyzing grade level formative data aligned to essential learning targets.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Work (workm@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Analyzing and using ongoing formative assessment and progress monitoring data to inform interventions and acceleration for ELA and math will help increase learning gains. This will be evidenced when discussing "What we will do for student who did not get it , and what we will do for those who already know it" (PLC Question 3 and 4). The progress monitoring data from Performance Matters and the frequent common formative assessments will be analyzed on an ongoing basis by coaches, admin, and teachers. This data will be used to group and re-group students accordingly. Teacher collaborative teams will come together quarterly utilizing SAI monies for writing teams to determine best intervention supports for the achievement of our Level 1 and 2 students. Grade level teams will analyze data, determine intervention needs and best resources to utilize for the upcoming quarter in order to ensure high levels of learning for all.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If teachers use ongoing formative assessment and progress monitoring data to intervene or accelerate students then students will receive timely and effective intervention. To monitor this strategy, we will complete classroom learning walks during our intervention/enrichment block, participate in data analysis conversations with teachers and progress monitor students on the mastery of essential learning targets in both ELA and math.
Action Steps to Implement	

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Through our PLC, we will foster a positive school community and culture where we are collectively committed to the success of all students. If we have high expectations and foster positive relationships, we will make Seminole Springs a place where people are collectively committed to ensuring high levels of learning for all.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on high levels of learning for all and building positive relationships we expect to see a decrease in the number of discipline referrals written by 15% from the 2020-2021 school year.
Monitoring:	EWS Data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Work (workm@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Fostering positive relationships and being collectively committed to high levels of learning for all students will help decrease the number of discipline referrals that are written and increase student attendance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we foster positive relationships and are collectively committed to all students, students will have a higher desire to come to school and lowering the number of discipline referrals will keep students in class learning at high levels.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers and staff will continue the implementation of the Leader in Me framework to implement The 7 Habits in all classrooms. Having a common language across campus will help to set positive expectations for student behaviors as well as build relationships.

When: 8/10/2021 - 6/7/2022
Frequency: Daily
Evidence: Classroom Learning Environment, Learning Walks, Student Feedback, Leader in Me stakeholder survey (student, staff and parents).

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

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 dashboard indicates Seminole Springs Elementary is "not found" - please advise.

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.

During the 2020-2021 school year, Seminole Springs Elementary began the journey of The Leader in Me framework. Leader in Me is an evidenced-based, comprehensive-school improvement model - developed in partnership with educators - that empowers students with the leadership and life skills they need to thrive in the 21st century. Leader in Me is based on a theory of change known as the See-Do-Get Cycle. When you change the way you SEE things, it influences what you DO and the results you GET. The Leader in Me experience begins with a whole new paradigm for education. Educators rediscover their passion through Leader in Me as it redirects their focus back to a deeper understanding of student achievement. Many people equate leadership with a formal position of authority. But we believe anyone can be a leader by intentionally leading one's own life (leading self) and working well with and encouraging the greatness in others - whether family, friends, neighbors, or colleagues (leading others).

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

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00