

Orange County Public Schools

Stone Lakes Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Stone Lakes Elementary

15200 STONEYBROOK BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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 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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rollins, Andrew	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Achievement • Student Safety • Skyward Captain • Student Observations • FTE Budget • DPLC • PTA/SAC Team • PLCs • Canvas • Data Chats • Staff Handbook • Planners • Hiring • School Safety • Threat Assessment Team • Other duties as assigned
Plank, Michelle	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Achievement • Observations • Behavior • Facility Use • Transportation • School Inventory • Team PLCs • Intern Assignments • Substitutes (no splitting) • Eagle Cafe • Threat Assessment Team • Digital Training • Data Chats • PTA/SAC • Attendance • Custodial • Safety Drills • Inputting Drills • Emergency Maps • Emergency Folders • Safe School Plan • Club Supervisor • Other duties as assigned
Benscoter, Jessica	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Achievement • Instructional Coach • Skyward Captain • PLC • Data Chats • Planning Days • SAC • Coaching Observations

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threat Assessment Team • Third Grade Portfolios • Instructional PD Skyward PD/trainings • Literacy Coaches Meetings • Advanced Coaching/FCS Meetings A • Approval of Dates on Master Calendar • Other duties as assigned SAC
Fink, Lee-ann	Curriculum Resource Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Achievement • Tier 3 MTSS Groups • Student Enrichment Support • Staff PD • Class Visits MTSS • Data Collection • Data Chats
Keyser, Felicia	Reading Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Achievement • Tier 3 MTSS Groups • Student Enrichment Support • Staff PD • Class Visits MTSS • Data Collection • Data Chats
Guenthner, Amy	Behavior Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESE Support • Student Behavior • Social Skill Groups • ESE Parent Liaison • Creating Behavior Improvement Plans
Nyffeler, Roberta	Staffing Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Achievement • ESE support • IEP Meetings • 504 Coordinator • PD for ESE grading • PD for Accommodations • Gifted screening/Testing PD for Exec. Functioning • FSAA Testing Coordinator
Morris, Alison	School Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEL Terrific Kids • Monthly Celebration • Student Counseling • Modeling Morning Meetings for teachers • Caring Schools • Community Implementation • SEL resource for teachers

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Countryman, Kelly	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PIE Coordinator • Spirit Nights • Media Center Trainings • Digital Training • Makerspace • Textbook Inventory • Book Fairs (2) Book It • Local Author Visits • Celebrate Literacy Week • SSYRA voting • Laminating • Facebook/Twitter Site • Media Classes • Accelerated Reader • Eagle's Nest (staff weekly newsletter) • School Nominations • ENN Broadcasts (morning news) • Other duties as assigned

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

When school testing data and school survey results are released, the leadership team works in collaboration to analyze the data to determine areas of focus for the SIP. The data includes FAST data, ESSA groups, and early warning signs. The school survey results include students, staff, and family surveys. After the data has been analyzed, the leadership team creates action steps to support the areas of focus for the SIP. The next step involves sharing the school data and school survey results with SAC and presenting the draft SIP. The SAC reviews the data, the areas of focus, and the action steps. SAC provides feedback and recommendations for the SIP. The SAC includes the principal, members of the leadership team, parents, teachers, staff, and business leaders. Finally, the draft SIP is shared with the entire school staff.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored every nine weeks. The monitoring process will include the leadership team reviewing the SIP areas of focus and utilizing data to determine if the action steps are leading to the successful attainment of the SIP goals. In addition, the SIP will be reviewed with grade-level teams to determine if progress is being made toward achieving the goal or if revisions need to be made to the action steps. Furthermore, the SIP results will be shared and discussed with SAC. The SAC team will have an opportunity to provide feedback and recommendations. Finally, the SIP will include an MOY

reflection which is required by the state. The MOY reflection will formally document the mid-year progress of the SIP.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	60%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	36%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	5	12	19	16	19	18	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	5	4	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	17	16	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	19	9	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	7	14	17	0	0	0	0	43

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	3	7	19	8	0	0	0	37

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	21	21	16	23	24	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	12	17	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	9	16	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	6	12	12	0	0	0	30

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	8	16	0	0	0	26

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	21	21	16	23	24	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	12	17	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	9	16	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	6	12	12	0	0	0	30

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	8	16	0	0	0	26

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	68	57	53	76	56	56	74		
ELA Learning Gains				73			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			60		
Math Achievement*	74	60	59	81	46	50	79		
Math Learning Gains				78			74		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68			66		
Science Achievement*	73	63	54	73	61	59	82		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	63	59	59	81			64		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	589
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	21	Yes	1	1
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	72			
HSP	63			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	51			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL	71			
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	82			
HSP	71			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	68			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	68			74			73					63
SWD	13			29			31				4	
ELL	59			70			50				5	63
AMI												
ASN	83			90			87				4	
BLK	65			68			83				3	
HSP	63			71			61				4	
MUL	69			69							2	
PAC												
WHT	70			74			76				4	
FRL	54			64			68				5	30

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	76	73	59	81	78	68	73					81
SWD	23	49	38	30	60	58	40					
ELL	69	71	63	72	79	69	65					81
AMI												
ASN	92	91		92	96		91					

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	81	78		84	78		91					
HSP	72	71	54	75	76	64	66					86
MUL	60			71								
PAC												
WHT	76	69	58	85	75	68	76					
FRL	64	68	59	69	75	68	57					80

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	74	67	60	79	74	66	82					64
SWD	15	25	30	23	42	45	33					
ELL	58	88		60	81		71					64
AMI												
ASN	83	71		95	93		94					
BLK	71	47		69	65	70	56					
HSP	68	66	58	70	73	58	79					54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80	72		86	72		90					75
FRL	62	67	53	64	76	58	59					67

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	67%	54%	13%	54%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	60%	21%	58%	23%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	62%	52%	10%	50%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	69%	59%	10%	59%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	88%	62%	26%	61%	27%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	55%	18%	55%	18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	72%	59%	13%	51%	21%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Overall, ELA showed the lowest performance at 70% proficiency. The contributing factor to last year's lower proficiency could be the MTSS process. Last year students remained in class with their homeroom teachers for ELA MTSS. This process meant the classroom teacher was responsible for providing intervention for all skills, which can be extremely difficult.

Students will follow the walk-to-intervention model for the 2023-2024 school year. The walk-to-intervention model allows students to transfer to different teachers in the grade level during ELA MTSS. Each teacher would focus on a "specialty" skill. This process would enable the students to receive targeted intervention based on their specific needs, which will positively impact student achievement.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Overall the data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year was ELA proficiency.

- ELA proficiency 2021-2022: 77%
- ELA proficiency 2022-2023: 70%

The contributing factor to last year's lower proficiency could be the MTSS process. Last year students

remained in class with their homeroom teachers for ELA MTSS. This process meant the classroom teacher was responsible for providing intervention for all skills, which can be extremely difficult.

Students will follow the walk-to-intervention model for the 2023-2024 school year. The walk-to-intervention model allows students to transfer to different teachers in the grade level during ELA MTSS. Each teacher would focus on a "specialty" skill. This process would enable the students to receive targeted intervention based on their specific needs, which will positively impact student achievement.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The school data points for ELA, Math, and Science are all above the district and state averages. Stone Lakes Elementary has historically exceeded the district and state averages for ELA, Math, and Science. This above-average achievement is attributed to students at Stone Lakes Elementary having a solid academic foundation in kindergarten through second grade. Additionally, student data is monitored consistently throughout the school year to support students and to make instructional changes when needed to maximize student academic progress and achievement.

Stone Lakes F.A.S.T. Data Points 2022-2023

- 3rd ELA proficiency: 62%
- 4th ELA proficiency: 81%
- 5th ELA proficiency: 67%

- 3rd Math proficiency: 69%
- 4th Math proficiency: 88%
- 5th Math proficiency: 73%

- 5th Science proficiency: 72%

District F.A.S.T. Data Points 2022-2023

- 3rd ELA proficiency: 52%
- 4th ELA proficiency: 60%
- 5th ELA proficiency: 54%

- 3rd Math proficiency: 59%
- 4th Math proficiency: 62%
- 5th Math proficiency: 55%

- 5th Science proficiency: 59%

State F.A.S.T. Data Points 2022-2023

- 3rd ELA proficiency: 50%
- 4th ELA proficiency: 58%
- 5th ELA proficiency: 54%

- 3rd Math proficiency: 59%
- 4th Math proficiency: 61%
- 5th Math proficiency: 55%

- 5th Science proficiency: 51%

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The FAST data points did not show an increase for the 2022-2023 school year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Reflecting on the EWS data points school attendance is a potential area of concern.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. ELA achievement
2. MTSS process
3. Student survey results (student sense of belonging)

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Stone Lakes Elementary will focus on overall FAST ELA proficiency for 3rd, 4th, and 5th-grade students, which decreased from 77% to 70% for the 2022-2023 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, overall FAST ELA proficiency for 3rd, 4th, and 5th-grade students will increase from 70% to 75% for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored by the following:

- PLC grade-level data meetings
- Teacher individual data meetings
- MTSS data
- FAST progress monitoring for August and December. PLC grade-level data meetings
- CRM monitoring throughout the year

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrew Rollins (andronidus.rollins@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Increase the progress monitoring of ELA with common assessments, FAST mock assessments, and the implementation and monitoring of Exact Path. Also, review and enhance the MTSS monitoring and documentation process. This will include MTSS professional development opportunities for teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Improving the systems utilized for progress monitoring will provide more frequent and accurate data related to each student. Additionally, research shows that a strong MTSS program increases student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Continue PLC grade-level data meetings.

Person Responsible: Andrew Rollins (andronidus.rollins@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023 and throughout the year.

Teacher individual data meetings (Teacher Data Chats).

Person Responsible: Andrew Rollins (andronidus.rollins@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023 and January 2024.

FAST progress monitoring for August 2023 and December 2023.

Person Responsible: Michelle Plank (michelle.plank@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023 and December 2023.

MTSS progress monitoring data review

Person Responsible: Felicia Keyser (felicia.keyser@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023 and will continue monthly through May 2024.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Stone Lakes Elementary will focus on the sense of belonging element, which decreased in the District student surveys for the 2022-2023 school year from 70% to 67%. This element was 2% points below the Innovation Office average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, Stone Lakes Elementary will observe a 4% increase in the sense of belonging element. Using the District student survey results, the domain related to school climate will increase from 67% to 71%.

Monitoring:

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

Informal data will be collected during the first semester of school and analyzed throughout the year to observe if progress is being made. This will also be monitored utilizing data from the District's annual survey provided to students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alison Morris (alison.morris@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Stone Lakes Elementary will continue to implement the Sanford and Harmony SEL curriculum. Additionally, morning meetings utilizing the Caring Schools curriculum will be mandatory for all classes. These SEL curriculum components have been approved by the District.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The SEL of students will have an impact on student behavior and positively impact the academic achievement of students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

- Stone Lakes Elementary will utilize a school-wide SEL program that will involve Guidance classroom visits.
- Review school-wide student behavior policies and procedures and make modifications as needed. This could have a positive impact on the school climate.

Person Responsible: Alison Morris (alison.morris@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023.

•Monitor the Implementation of morning meetings using the District-approving Caring Schools curriculum. This will be mandatory for all schools.

Person Responsible: Andrew Rollins (andronidus.rollins@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023.

•Review school-wide student behavior policies and procedures and make modifications as needed. This could have a positive impact on the school climate.

Person Responsible: Lee-ann Fink (lee-ann.fink@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023.

Have a laser focus on celebrating all heritage months. This includes school-wide highlights in classrooms, the school morning news, social media, and the school Sunday newsletter.

Person Responsible: Michelle Plank (michelle.plank@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023.

Continue to host the annual Multicultural Family Night in April. This annual event is one of the most attended events at Stone Lakes Elementary. Families are invited to showcase their counties which can include literature about their county, attire, popular foods, and entertainment.

Person Responsible: Alison Morris (alison.morris@ocps.net)

By When: April 2024.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

N/A-Stone Lakes Elementary was not identified as a ATSI, TSI or CSI school.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	Tutoring		1771 - Stone Lakes Elementary	General Fund		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: ELA Tutoring 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade.</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$0.00
					Total:	\$5,000.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes