

Orange County Public Schools

Lake Sybelia Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lake Sybelia Elementary

600 SANDSPUR RD, Maitland, FL 32751

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

Demographics

Principal: John Dobbs

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (43%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (52%)
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	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lake Sybelia Elementary

600 SANDSPUR RD, Maitland, FL 32751

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create an enriching and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dobbs, John	Principal	Supports grade levels 3rd - 5th, PTA Board, School Advisory Council, Grade Level Team Leaders, and Car Riders
Murray, Maria	Assistant Principal	Supports grade levels kindergarten - 2nd, Bus Riders, Lunchroom, and Paraprofessional Duties
Sheldon, Ann	Instructional Coach	Coaching of the classroom teacher in instructional practice
Noonan, Rachael	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Testing Coordinator, Curriculum Support, MTSS Coordinator, ESE Support

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/14/2022, John Dobbs

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

460

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

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

12

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	52	81	81	84	59	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	435
Attendance below 90 percent	3	29	30	33	26	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	10	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	11	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	7	7	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Thursday 7/14/2022

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	49%	56%	56%				64%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	49%						57%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	17%						37%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	51%	46%	50%				68%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	57%						61%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	29%						36%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	61%	59%				48%	56%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	70%	57%	13%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	67%	62%	5%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	84%	63%	21%	64%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	26	22	10	25	31	16	17				
ELL	38	58		44	21						
BLK	36	51	15	39	57	23	46				
HSP	57	53		53	58		55				
WHT	62	40		64	54		50				
FRL	43	42	20	43	54	37	50				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	13	35		29	35		40				
ELL	40			50							
BLK	40	29		40	18		44				
HSP	39	40		46	53		71				
WHT	65	74		73	68		75				
FRL	34	40	18	35	40	27	46				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	24	34	29	41	48	29	19				
ELL	61	63		68	68	40					
BLK	45	53	27	47	53	38	27				
HSP	59	55	43	64	53	25	50				
WHT	75	54		82	69		63				
FRL	50	54	34	55	53	34	37				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	92
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

We have a consistent challenge in making learning gains with the students in our Deaf and Hard of Hearing program Varying Exceptionalities students. These students make up at least 50% of our bottom 25% which seems to be our greatest challenge. ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25% down 19% from 36% to 17%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Reading is clearly an area where we need to increase student learning gains overall.

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

Lack of learning gains from ESE students. The lack of resources that support student growth for our Deaf and Hard of Hearing students. Ensure that students are provided interventions that match their deficits. Create an MTSS flow map and electronic data tracking and graphing. Provide adequate training on intervention materials to be used. The majority of teachers are new this year so it would benefit them to take place in the professional development.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

We made a 6% gain in our overall learning gains in Math.

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

We focused a great deal of effort on Math based on the initial data at the beginning of last year, and many students made gains. We intentionally pushed in to monitor math instruction including small groups. However, many of the students in the bottom 25% did not show these same gains.

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

We need to increase students' reading comprehension skills at all levels, but focus intense effort on the bottom 25% which is made up of a majority of ESE students.

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

We will provide teachers and staff with training in the new BEST standards implementation in Reading and Math. We will provide training and support for the implementation of the new reading and math series that have been adopted.

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

We will have two interventionist positions that we did not have last year. These teachers will push into the classroom to provide additional support during Tier I instruction. They will focus attention on those with the greatest need.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

We have a consistent challenge in making learning gains with the students in our Deaf and Hard of Hearing program and Varying Exceptionalities students. These students make up at least 45% of our bottom 25% which seems to be our greatest challenge. ELA Reading Learning Gains Lowest 25% down 19% from 36% to 17%.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will utilize the i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment to identify students in the bottom 25% sub-group that is predominantly Students with Disabilities (SWD) represented by the bottom 25% group will increase their score by 36 points from their baseline i-Ready Reading BOY score.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor students within the lowest 25% using the results of the i-Ready Reading Diagnostic Assessments given throughout the school year to monitor student learning gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Dobbs (john.dobbs@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We will provide students within this targeted sub-group with increased levels of support using the Interventionists and tutors to target grade level and deficient academic skills as well as focused support for reading comprehension using Leveled Learning Intervention Resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

During the prior year, we had many students start the school year with large deficiencies in their reading ability. We believe that too much time was utilized remediating below grade level deficiencies in areas besides reading comprehension and as such impacted student outcomes on the FSA Reading results.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Conduct beginning-of-the-year assessments in I-Ready and FAST and determine the students that make up the bottom 25% of students in grades 3-5 in order to target the support for this group of students.

Person Responsible

Rachael Noonan (rachael.noonan@ocps.net)

Assess the targeted group of students using the Fountas and Pinnell Assessment and place students in the appropriate intervention groups to receive LLI instruction.

Person Responsible

Ann Sheldon (ann.sheldon@ocps.net)

Conduct bi-weekly assessments using the Fountas and Pinnell Assessment to monitor individual student progress within this subgroup and determine the effectiveness of instruction and those students are placed accordingly.

Person Responsible

Rachael Noonan (rachael.noonan@ocps.net)

Conduct individual student data meetings with students within this sub-group on a periodic basis to encourage students' academic efforts and encourage them in positive ways.

Person Responsible

Ann Sheldon (ann.sheldon@ocps.net)

Provide targeted academic support for the target group using the i-Ready Teacher Toolbox utilizing the Academic Tutors during small group instruction.

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

Provide After-School Tutoring two days a week prioritizing this group of students for participation using acceleration strategies for instruction with the support of grade teams.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Florida has adopted a new set of reading and math standards called the BEST Standards. This is the first year for teachers to be exposed to the new standards and as such have limited familiarity with them

Measurable

Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will monitor the baseline data from the BOY Administration of the i-Ready ELA assessment and the Symphony Math assessment to monitor student progress throughout the year. We hope to see an average increase of 30% of students on grade level. We also intend to see that overall proficiency increase on our FAST results in ELA (from 27% to 57%) and math (from 7% to 37%) from the beginning-of-the-year assessments to the end-of-year assessments.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will complete the i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment, Symphony Math assessment, and FAST three times during the year in an effort to assess students' acquisition of the new standards and teachers' ability to convey these standards in an effective manner.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maria Murray (maria.murray@ocps.net)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We will meet with grade-level PLCs two days a week (one for Reading and one for Math). We will support teachers' understanding of the new standards during these planning sessions along with their ability to assess students' understanding and adapt their instruction to meet the diverse needs of students.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

There is a volume of research on the effectiveness of Professional Learning Communities in positively affecting student outcomes. The increase of time to plan instruction with support should clearly influence student outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide teachers opportunities to participate in the district-provided training covering content from the new BEST standards.

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

Conduct individual grade level Professional Learning Community Meeting for Reading and Math weekly, supporting instruction planning using the BEST Standards.

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

We will have our Problem Solvers Team present instructional practice strategies utilizing the BEST Standards throughout the year.

Person Responsible Maria Murray (maria.murray@ocps.net)

We will send representatives to the various subject areas to the Impact Training to gather strategies and methods of instruction in the various core subject areas and share them within grade level PLCs.

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

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Student Interactions**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on our Panorama Survey Data We believe that students often do not have the self-management skills to cope with conflict, by supporting students in building these skills, overall student academic outcomes will improve.

Measurable Outcome:**State the specific**

measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Based on Panorama Survey we will increase the percentage of students that perceive others as being respectful to others by 15% to 46% on the Panorama Survey.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will review data gathered from students through the Student Surveys, observations within the class meetings, and discipline data to determine progress related to our targeted outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Maria Murray (maria.murray@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Students make additions and deletions to revise previous knowledge and thinking processes in order to deepen understanding. By using social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making, students have an awareness of the power of interpretations and take various perspectives.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Students' revision of knowledge enhances the development of declarative knowledge, allowing students to add to and sharpen their knowledge base. By attending to the conative needs of students in connection with this cognitive process, teachers help to support student facilitation of responsible decision-making and cooperative learning skills.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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

Person Responsible

John Dobbs (john.dobbs@ocps.net)

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

Person Responsible

Maria Murray (maria.murray@ocps.net)

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

Person Responsible

John Dobbs (john.dobbs@ocps.net)

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

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

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

All grade levels K-2 were above 50% based on the End of Year i-Ready Assessment. We believe that a contributing factor for struggling students in upper grades was the intervention strategies used last year to support struggling students did not provide enough support for comprehension, We are shifting our strategy to include Leveled Literacy Intervention to support students' need for comprehension support.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The percentage of Third and Fourth Grade students at Lake Sybelia Elementary was below 50% based on the FSA results. We believe that a contributing factor was the intervention strategies used last year to support struggling students did not provide enough support for comprehension, We are shifting our strategy to include Leveled Literacy Intervention to support students' need for comprehension support.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percentage of students that are on-level in reading in K-2 will be above 50% based on the EOY results on the FAST Assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percentage of students that are on-level in reading in the Third and Fourth Grade will be above 50% based on the EOY results on the FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

We will utilize the results from the FAST Assessment to monitor students' progress within the targeted grade levels to determine progress and any need to adjust our efforts throughout the year. We will also review Classroom Walkthrough Data during small group instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dobbs, John, john.dobbs@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The Leveled Literacy instruction program is a scientifically researched Reading Intervention program. These materials will support students' understanding of comprehension strategies that will move them closer to grade-level reading ability.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Based on prior years' results when we utilized Leveled Literacy intervention students achieved a higher percentage of success than in the most recent results in which the materials were minimally utilized.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
The first step is to provide teachers training in utilizing the Leveled Literacy Intervention materials within the grade level PLCs.	Sheldon, Ann, ann.sheldon@ocps.net
We will utilize data from the STAR Assessment to determine which students to assess using the Fountas and Pinnell assessment for placement in the Leveled Literacy Intervention program.	Sheldon, Ann, ann.sheldon@ocps.net
We will monitor students' progress using the Fountas and Pinnell assessment and adjust students' support based on the data from the assessment.	Dobbs, John, john.dobbs@ocps.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

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

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

Students - Work collaboratively together during learning and participate actively during Life Skill Learning lessons.

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

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

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