Laureate Park Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Laureate Park Elementary

7800 LAUREATE BLVD, Orlando, FL 32827

https://laureateparkes.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Suzanne Workum

Start Date for this Principal: 6/17/2017

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	17%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: No Grade
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

Laureate Park Elementary

7800 LAUREATE BLVD, Orlando, FL 32827

https://laureateparkes.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	14%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we 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
Workum, Suzanne	Principal	-Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision making, collaborative lesson planning, effective instructional practices and intervention -Manages school resources, including but not limited to: facilities, budget, personnel, materials and supplies that are designed to support the school improvement goals -Oversees high quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement -Maintains communication with all stakeholder groups -Ensures instruction is rigorous, relevant and standards based -Common Planning - Supports assigned grade levels
Ramsey, Kathleen	Assistant Principal	-Ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS and addressing goals and targets in the SIP -Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation -Ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation -Discipline -Ensures instruction is rigorous, relevant and standards based -Common Planning - Supports assigned grade levels -Threat Assessment Team Member -Conducts Observations
Diaz-Quintero, Ingrid	ELL Compliance Specialist	-ELL Compliance -ELL Progress Monitor -Coaching Observation -Arrival Duty -Caught Being Kind -Mentors -Hispanic Heritage/Black History Month
Downs, Megan	Staffing Specialist	- Documents interventions and provides follow-up to ensure student success - Facilitates and supports data collection activities - Assists in data analysis - Supports the implementation of Tier I, II and III intervention plans that address goals identified in the SIP. -Supports ESE students with assessments and strategies for ELL assistance and compliance -Monitors FTE -Threat Assessment Team Member

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Furio, Judy	Instructional Media	-Oversees the Media Center -Creates POs for purchases for the Media Center (books and resources) -Oversees the News Crew -Manages Destiny -Holds literacy lessons -Conducts annual book inventory
Levenson, Lisa	Instructional Coach	-Oversee and facilities all of the MTSS process -Instructional Support/Progress Monitor -Gifted Facilitator/PLC -Coaching Observation -Social Media
Thompson, Kathleen	School Counselor	-Social Skills Training -Threat Assessment Leader -Counsels Students
Harrington, Jantez	Teacher, K-12	-Oversees and coordinates all school, district and state testing throughout the year. -Math/Science Night -Partners in ED/Teach In -Coaching Observation -Tutoring -Oration
Waldbieser, Allison	Teacher, K-12	-Progress Monitor/MTSS -Spelling Bee -Literacy Night -Caught Being Kind -Arrival Duty

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 6/17/2017, Suzanne Workum

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.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

927

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

4

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

5

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	11	128	147	131	125	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	0	11	12	3	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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

Tuesday 7/20/2021

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	14	177	153	170	168	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	830
Attendance below 90 percent	3	16	3	5	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	2	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	2	1	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	14	177	153	170	168	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	830
Attendance below 90 percent	3	16	3	5	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	2	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	2	1	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				80%	57%	57%	82%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				69%	58%	58%	69%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	52%	53%	50%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				83%	63%	63%	85%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				76%	61%	62%	70%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	48%	51%	63%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				77%	56%	53%	75%	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	84%	55%	29%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	75%	57%	18%	58%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2021					
	2019	72%	54%	18%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	80%	62%	18%	62%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	84%	63%	21%	64%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2021					
	2019	79%	57%	22%	60%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	73%	54%	19%	53%	20%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Laureate Park Elementary utilizes i-Ready Diagnostic assessments for ELA and Math as well as Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMAs) for Science three times a year.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	55 / 35%	89/51%	125/71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9 / 27%	14/36%	24/62%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 20%	6/40%	9/60%
	English Language Learners	6 / 20%	7/21%	19/58%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	42/27%	75/43%	113/64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/24%	10/26%	19/49%
	Students With Disabilities	1/7%	4/27%	8/53%
	English Language Learners	17%	8/24%	16/48%

Grade 2			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	64 / 43%	86/55%	112/71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 / 33%	16/48%	22/67%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 15%	3/20%	4/27%
	English Language Learners	10 / 28%	12/32%	20/53%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29/20%	66/43%	91/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/12%	8/24%	10/31%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/7%	3/21%
	English Language Learners	11%	10/26%	13/34%

Grade 3			
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67 / 45%	95/61%	115/73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 / 29%	15/39%	24/63%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 31%	4/29%	7/47%
	English Language Learners	9 / 23%	14/36%	21/53%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/9%	39/25%	88/56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/3%	2/5%	12/32%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	4/27%
	English Language Learners	1/3%	5/13%	14/35%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62 / 39%	77/47%	168/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 19%	10/31%	15/47%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 13%	1/6%	2/13%
	English Language Learners	7 / 21%	6/17%	11/31%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29/18%	63/38%	101/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/10%	9/27%	13/41%
	Students With Disabilities	2/13%	2/13%	3/19%
	English Language Learners	2/6%	5/14%	12/34%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42 / 32%	53/39%	60/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 26%	10/34%	10/34%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 10%	3/30%	4/40%
	English Language Learners	3 / 12%	3/11%	8/30%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30/22%	49/36%	81/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/13%	10/34%	12/41%
	Students With Disabilities	1/10%	1/10%	1/10%
	English Language Learners	2/8%	6/22%	15/56%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	99/77%	96/72%	103/75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/62%	16/67%	18/72%
	Students With Disabilities	4/50%	4/44%	4/50%
	English Language Learners	12/52%	13/50%	17/68%

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	37			41							
ELL	63	67	50	68	71		53				
ASN	94	100		91	62		85				
BLK	84			64							
HSP	73	66	53	67	54	33	63				
MUL	93			93							
WHT	90	67		85	60	60	84				
FRL	71	56		60	42	27	65				

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	34	50	53	34	68	60	27				
ELL	65	71	63	70	77	75	56				
ASN	92	81		97	76		80				
BLK	65	67		76	75						
HSP	74	69	64	79	75	77	65				
MUL	100			100							
WHT	84	67	50	82	77	46	93				
FRL	69	75	75	69	78	71	52				

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	30			50							
ELL	56	57	47	63	66	47					
ASN	82	67		86	50						
BLK	71			71							
HSP	85	67	54	87	67	64	70				
WHT	82	70	42	85	73	73	79				
FRL	76	59	47	75	68	56	67				

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	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	74

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	537
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	64
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	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	74
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	60
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	93

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	74
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	56
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?

Reviewing iReady diagnostic data for the 2020-2021 school year, All grade levels, 1-5, demonstrated significant growth from the fall diagnostic to the spring diagnostic in both ELA and Math. ELA fall diagnostic data results indicated 32% of all students were at the proficient level. ELA spring diagnostic data increased to 63% proficient, a growth of 31%. Conversely, in Math the fall diagnostic data results indicated 19% of all students were at the proficient level. The Math spring diagnostic data increased to 59% proficient, a growth of 40%.
Students in grades 4 and 5 did not demonstrate the same growth as students in grades 1-3 on the ELA diagnostic with only a 15% increase in proficiency from the fall to the spring diagnostic. In addition, when analyzing data within the subgroups, Students with Disabilities demonstrated the least amount of growth among all of the subgroups on both the ELA and Math diagnostics.
FSA data from the 2018-2019 school year will be used to calculate learning gains for the 2020-2021 FSA. Therefore a closer look at third grade data is warranted. 135 students tested for ELA and 136 for Math on the FSA. The lowest 25% percent contains 34 students. Twenty-one of those third graders scored a level one or two on the FSA ELA and twenty-seven scored a level one or two on FSA Math.

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

The ELA and Math Lowest 25th Percentile components had the lowest performance for the 2018-2019 school year. In addition, Students with Disabilities demonstrated the least amount of growth among all of the subgroups on both the ELA and Math iReady diagnostics for the 2021-2022 school year.

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

Students who used the LaunchED platform during the 2020-21 school year did not reliably attend class instruction, in particular, students in 4th and 5th grades. In addition, students with disabilities were not logging for ESE services consistently. Actions to improve this need is a return to face-to-face instruction and support facilitation in the classrooms.

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

For the 2018-2019 school year, the data component which showed the most improvement was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile.

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

Contributing factors to the improvement included more focus on MTSS and small group instruction. In addition, an interventionist work with Tier III students to provided more individualized support in ELA and Math.

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

Laureate Park Elementary will be developing and implementing the After-School Acceleration Program. In addition, gifted and high achieving students are clustered in each grade level allowing the gifted-endorsed teacher(s) to accelerate learning. In ELA and Math, enrichment activities are embedded during WIN intervention time to provide acceleration for our students who are on or above grade level.

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.

Professional development will focus on teachers learning strategies to analyze unit assessments to determine focus skills to be written into lesson plans and daily instruction in order to increase overall performance on unit assessments. Conversely, this will decrease the need for small group instruction/ remediation.

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

An additional service provided to students is our MTSS Teacher Interventionist. The intervention teacher works with students who have been identified as Tier III in reading or math through the MTSS process.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	All students will be taught grade level standards-based instruction to increase student achievement with core content to ensure that they have the opportunity to access the content and skills outlined within each grade level standard. Students are more likely to learn and increase their academic achievement because the instruction is focused and because the students are assessed on what they are being taught.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of standards based instruction being taught in core content areas, 63% of our students will earn a level 3 or higher on state assessments. Student growth and learning will be monitored through formative assessments and progress monitoring tools.
Monitoring:	Students' Formative, Summative and Diagnostic data along with Classroom Walk-through and i-Observation data will be reviewed to track trends and make adjustments. Lesson plans will also be checked especially with a focus on small group instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Suzanne Workum (suzanne.workum@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will document in their lesson plans about small group instruction, practice they are providing to students as well as strategies being taught and assessed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These evidence based strategies will allow the teacher to make instructional decisions and provide students with support.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will implement the MTSS process with fidelity using data to monitor student progress.

Person Responsible	Lisa Levenson (lisa.levenson@ocps.net)

Instructional Coach and administration will support planning of teachers in grades K-5. Leadership team will monitor instruction through weekly walk-throughs. Data will be reviewed and analyzed on Fridays to ensure appropriate instruction is taking place. MTSS data will be discussed with grade level teams and appropriate groupings and appropriate targets of instruction will be a focus of discussed.

Person Responsible	Lisa Levenson (lisa.levenson@ocps.net)

Teachers will provide appropriate scaffolding within their small groups targeting specific needs.

Person Responsible	Suzanne Workum (suzanne.workum@ocps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Description- Laureate Park will continue to establish a culture of social emotional learning with adults and students through monthly meetings with the SELL team and students monthly meetings with the guidance counselor. Rationale- Evidence shows that SEL programs tend to increase academic achievement and positive social interactions. SEL helps to build competencies for academic growth and overall well-being.
Measurable Outcome:	Laureate Park's school counselor will monitor the threat assessments and her social emotional groups using a committee where the academic achievement of those students who need support will be monitored. By the end of 2021-2022 school year, we will decrease the number of students with less than 90% attendance and the number of students monitored by the Threat Assessment Team by 5%, and increase learning gains of the lowest 25% of students in ELA and Math by at least 3 percentage points.
Monitoring:	School surveys and student social emotional charts will be used to monitor academic growth and the overall effectiveness of the SELL program which will be shared by the school counselor with the leadership team so any concerns may be addressed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathleen Ramsey (kathleen.ramsey@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Tracking both the effectiveness of the SELL program along with student achievement will produce evidence that positive results occurs when the culture and climate is positive and nurturing.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has shown that programs that support students' development in communicating effectively, negotiating conflict, practicing empathy, understanding their own skills and abilities, managing their emotions and behavior and other social emotional skills can lead to better academic and overall life outcome.

Action Steps to Implement

The SELL team will attend scheduled professional development sessions and provide training to teachers and staff for best practices to help with the academic growth of our students as well as social emotional growth.

Person Responsible	Suzanne Workum (suzanne.workum@ocps.net)

Common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning will continue.

Person Responsible	Kathleen Ramsey (kathleen.ramsey@ocps.net)

Strategies taught during PD for social and emotional learning with adults and students to positively impact school culture and climate will be implemented.

Person Responsible	Kathleen Ramsey (kathleen.ramsey@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.

Laureate Park Elementary School did not report any incident counts to the Florida DOE in 2019-2020.

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.

A positive school culture through collaborative efforts is created among staff, parents and students which is key to increasing academic growth for students. By incorporating parents as partners in their children's education as well as increase the opportunities for all stakeholders to better communicate, the school will produce the positive environment needed to foster learning. Parents and community members are invited to join ADDitions, PTA and SAC. Students are encouraged to participate in opportunities that will facilitate the development of enjoyment in the school process, leadership skills and ownership of the school community.

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

Leadership -
-Suzanne Workum, Principal and Kathleen Ramsey, Assistant Principal

Guidance Counselor-
-Kathleen Thompson- to monitor and oversee the social-emotional well-being of students and staff

Teachers - to provide a structured and caring classroom environment that is conducive to learning. Create trusting relationships with students and staff to promote social-emotional stability and a positive culture at Laureate Park.

PTA - to make every child's potential a reality by engaging and empowering families and communities to advocate for all children.

SAC - to serve as a resource for the school principal and to assist in the preparation and evaluation of the school improvement plan

Partners in Education - to share resources, both in people and materials.

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				$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5900	100-Salaries	0331 - Laureate Park Elementary	Title, I Part A		$10,000.00
			Notes: Tutoring			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	0331 - Laureate Park Elementary	General Fund		$10,000.00
			Notes: Professional Development Coverage			
					Total:	$20,000.00