Seminole Springs Elementary School

2022-23 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: 6/1/2019

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	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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
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
Hargroves, Maria	Assistant Principal	
Masek, Tia L.	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Vitale, Christina M.	Other	
Ankeny, Laura A.	School Counselor	
Smith, Jessica B.	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 6/1/2019, Kyle Bracewell

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.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

474

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

10

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

9

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	0	63	78	80	81	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	373
Attendance below 90 percent	0	21	29	27	22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	8	17	20	20	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Course failure in Math	0	8	17	20	19	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	19	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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

Monday 8/8/2022

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	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		
Course failure in ELA	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		
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		
Students retained two or more times	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	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	

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	56%	50%	56%				63%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	54%	61%				61%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	48%	52%				62%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	61%	52%	60%				71%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	53%	52%	64%				56%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	41%	55%				41%	39%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	45%	51%				60%	54%	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	62%	60%	2%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	60%	5%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	56%	59%	-3%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

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	76%	62%	14%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	80%	61%	19%	64%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2022					
	2019	51%	57%	-6%	60%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	57%	56%	1%	53%	4%
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	37	59	56	40	63	71	32				
ELL	48	65		52	75						
HSP	41	54		46	70	73	36				
MUL	44	75		38	58						
WHT	61	57	50	65	49	50	52				
FRL	46	57	52	55	62	77	38				

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				
FRL	59	53	55	65	49	37	50				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	455
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	55
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	56
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?

While we took a dip in our overall proficiency, we made significant improvement in our Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains.

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

ELA - proficiency, learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains.
Science - proficiency

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

Our ELA scores took a dip from previous year's data. We may have experienced an implementation dip due to the new curriculum. In addition, our attendance rates suffered during the 21-22 school year.

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

Math learning gains of all students and specifically our lowest quartile students.

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

Our two fourth grade math teachers produced incredibly strong data. Through our collaborative planning time, utilizing the four PLC questions, these teachers were able to show the highest lowest quartile gains in the county.

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

We are going to provide professional development for our teachers in Grades 3-5 to focus on implementing the Volume of Reading as a way to accelerate learning around Essential Learning Targets.

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.

Beginning in August, teachers will participate in professional learning with Susan Emrick and our school's Literacy Coach, Jessica Smith around the Volume of Reading. Follow up learning opportunities will be embedded in our twice a week grade level collaborative planning.

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

Seminole Springs Elementary is committed to continue our efforts to be a true Professional Learning Community. The systems and structures that we have built over the past three years, will continue throughout this year and we will work to onboard and support our new instructional staff members around the highly effective practices that we implement.

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
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 the ELA, Math and Science FSA results from the Needs Assessment/ Analysis section, Instructional Practice as it relates to standards-aligned instruction is one of our most critical areas of focus. This area of focus was assigned as a critical area of need because the data indicates gaps in proficiency across grade levels in both ELA and Math and in fifth grade Science. Teachers will intentionally plan for and engage students in standards-aligned instruction with a focus on utilizing all five core components of the District's Instructional Framework.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By focusing on this area, we expect to see increases in our state assessment data (FAST) from: ELA: from 56%-60% Math: from 61% - 62% Science: from 48%-60%
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	PM 1, PM 2 and PM 3 iReady Assessment Data Common Formative Assessment FAST Assessment Data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Work (workm@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will continue to work as a Professional Learning Community during grade level collaborative planning with an intense focus on ensuring high levels of learning for all students. The four PLC questions will guide collaborative planning time agendas in the form of a "Learning Loop."
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for	All of the work that we do a Seminole Springs Elementary is funneled through the PLC process.

selecting this strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Signs

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 the Early Warning Signs from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section list, attendance is one of our most critical areas of focus. Attendance was identified as a critical area of focus because 123 students are starting the school year that had an attendance rate of less than 90% from last school year.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	We will utilize our EWS data to track and monitor our students who are not meeting a 90% or above attendance rate. It is our goal that no more than 10% of our students have an EWS indicator for attendance (approximately 50 students).
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Our school's EWS team will monitor attendance (Guidance, Social Worker, Mental Health and PASS teacher).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laura A. Ankeny (ankenyl@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The team will utilize the highly effective practices that they were trained on at the Lake County Schools EWS Academy in June 2022.
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 direct correlation between attendance and academic achievement.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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 the FSA ELA data from the Needs Assessment/ Analysis section our Learning Gains and Lowest Quartile Learning Gains is one of our most critical areas of focus.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	On the FAST ELA Assessment we will make the following gains: ELA Learning Gains: from 58%-65% ELA LQ Learning Gains: from 52%-65%
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	PM 1, PM 2, and PM 3 Common Formative Assessment Intervention/Acceleration Assessments iReady FAST Data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Work (workm@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Four days a week we will implement Flex-Grouping during our acceleration block.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Students will be flexibly grouped based on a common assessment around essential learning targets and will receive either intervention or acceleration.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

During the 2020-2021 school year, Seminole Springs 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).

This year we will continue our implementation - Year 3 - working alongside our Leader in Me Coach for ongoing staff learning and implementation support.

In addition to Leader in Me - grade level teams have developed norms for their team and an accountability measure to monitor their norms. As a school, we ensure all staff members support and contribute to our Collective Commitments which help to ensure a positive school culture and environment.

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

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, through our PTO, SAC and other family engagement events, families will learn how to support their child at home with our Leader in Me framework. Community Partners and family stakeholders will work together with school staff to ensure Seminole Springs is a great place to learn and work!