

Orange County Public Schools

Lake Silver Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lake Silver Elementary

2401 N RIO GRANDE AVE, Orlando, FL 32804

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

Demographics

Principal: Shelia Burke

Start Date for this Principal: 6/2/2020

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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	[not available]
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Burke, Sheila	Principal	Responsible for all school operations, decision-making, and areas of instruction.
Murray, Maria	Assistant Principal	Responsible for supporting all school operations, decision making, and areas of instruction.
Giessler, Josh	Behavior Specialist	Supports ESE student behavior, social skills goals, IEPs and BIPs.
McCauley, Robin	Staffing Specialist	Works with all ESE teachers, families, students, and MTSS coach to serve and support students.
Bigio, Charlotte	Instructional Coach	Math Coach, coaching observations, PLC support, Skyward Captain.
Torres, Zaida	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Testing coordinator, supports ELL students, program placement, ACCESS testing, first-grade support teacher.
Mitchell, Diana	Dean	Supports student behavior, safety, supervision.
Ares Flores, Raymond	Guidance Counselor	Member of threat assessment team, supports student and family needs, health initiative, counsel students groups, and individually.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/2/2020, Shelia Burke

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

1

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

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

475

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

6

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

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	21	77	79	82	76	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	448
Attendance below 90 percent	4	26	24	22	27	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	9	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	3	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	2	0	4	5	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/26/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	24	77	84	84	120	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	467
Attendance below 90 percent	4	11	12	25	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	5	16	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	1	5	18	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	1	0	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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	24	77	84	84	120	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	467
Attendance below 90 percent	4	11	12	25	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	5	16	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	1	5	18	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	1	0	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	39%			51%	57%	57%	56%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	45%			56%	58%	58%	60%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%			43%	52%	53%	41%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	36%			52%	63%	63%	61%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	38%			60%	61%	62%	62%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%			41%	48%	51%	48%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	45%			44%	56%	53%	62%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	55%	-6%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	57%	-1%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	63%	-5%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	57%	-5%	60%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Diagnostic for ELA and Math 1st-5th grades: BOY, MOY, EOY. Science OCPS PMAs covering the Big Ideas.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29	28	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	14	20
	Students With Disabilities	10	0	11
	English Language Learners	0	20	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21	21	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	10	26
	Students With Disabilities	13	11	0
	English Language Learners	0	20	25

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17	18	24
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	9	11
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	7	23
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	4	16
	Students With Disabilities	17	0	20
	English Language Learners	17	0	14

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	24	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	11	16
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	11
	English Language Learners	0	40	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	12	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	0	9
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	11
	English Language Learners	0	0	20

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10	16	23
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	6	13
	Students With Disabilities	0	4	4
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2	13	22
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	3	9
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	8
	English Language Learners	0	0	11

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12	10	17
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	2	10
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	11
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6	6	19
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	2	8
	Students With Disabilities	6	0	0
	English Language Learners	11	0	11
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	44	41	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	34	48
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	22	38	63

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	16	33	36	16	33		13				
ELL	25			19							
BLK	25	33	50	24	34	45	32				
HSP	39	50		22	28		47				
WHT	73	73		77	64		80				
FRL	30	40	50	25	33	42	38				
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	25	23	42	25	44	27	27				
ELL	48	42		48	58						
BLK	38	49	34	41	52	38	28				
HSP	59	39		53	61		60				

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
WHT	73	77		84	74		71				
FRL	41	47	38	40	51	38	30				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	25	50	47	30	71	77	19				
ELL	35	57		50	71						
BLK	35	47	39	43	57	45	31				
HSP	58	55		74	56		64				
MUL	86			73							
WHT	80	82		84	69		87				
FRL	41	52	38	50	60	42	46				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	335
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	84%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	27
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	35
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	37
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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
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
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	73
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

All subgroups decreased in learning gains for ELA and Math except our Black subgroup in ELA. Science showed an increase in all subgroups except for SWD.

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

Students with disabilities (SWD) learning gains decreased by 27% in both ELA and Math 2019 assessments. Our progress monitoring also indicates the lowest subgroup percentage for proficiency is SWD in 4 out of 5 grades 1st-5th in ELA and Math.

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

Based on the 2019 data reflection Lake Silver switched from a pull-out resource model to support facilitation. This was to limit the loss of instructional time in Tier 1 and Tier 2 in order to maximize the support within the classroom. In November 2020, 41% of our SWD were attending school via online LaunchEd. The original support facilitation groupings were vastly changed from the beginning of the school year through the end. By May 2021, 26% of our SWD were still attending school via online Launched.

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

Based on progress monitoring, Science showed the most improvement with increased scores over time. Comparing scores of our student's reading ability to science content knowledge indicated 5th grade over performed expectancy on our Science PMA 3 compared to grade-level reading ability.

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

In addition to focused vocabulary instruction and virtual labs, Lake Silver added a STEAM lab elective to include hands-on projects. Our math coach expanded support through science coaching, creating lesson plans, and analyzing data.

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

Using the district acceleration lesson plans and framework built into the CRMs. Using the iReady prerequisites report informing instruction and guide for scaffolding comprehension.

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.

During preplanning and professional learning communities (PLC), we would utilize the acceleration framework based upon the writings of Suzy Pepper Rollins in Learning in the Fast Lane and Teaching in the Fast Lane. Throughout the year as a PLC will analyze classroom data to make informed decisions for instruction.

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

Lake Silver will have a dedicated interventionist per grade level to assist with Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction along with a dedicated Tier 3 interventionist. Our leadership team has been assigned a specific grade level to support and monitor. Lake Silver added STEAM Lab to our special rotation. Lake Silver will continue to use the support facilitation model with our SWD subgroup with fidelity.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Description: Integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally
 Rationale: Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By strengthening our school’s culture for social and emotional learning, we will address School Climate.

Measureable Outcome: Based on the Panorama survey data, Lake Silver staff responses of the School Climate category was 61% and our goal for the school year is to increase by 4% to 65%.

Monitoring: Through Classroom Walkthrough trend data we will monitor the use of our social-emotional curriculum materials. We will continue to monitor qualitative data from staff, to ensure we are working towards our goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sheila Burke (sheila.burke@ocps.net)

Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning focused on implementing a school-wide SEL curriculum, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies, and deliberate school supports for families.

Evidence-based Strategy: Description of Monitoring: Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of the Culture and Climate continuum, needs assessments, classroom observations, school environment observations, and implementation surveys. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, staff needs, and family needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building, including its families. To strengthen a culture of social and emotional learning with families, staff, and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement and change.

Resources/Criteria: Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor, Measure, and Modify. Evaluate the climate and culture for social and emotional learning to implement necessary responsive practices Implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning & leadership that uses cycles of professional learning. Evaluate the impact of cycles of professional learning on improvement efforts. Monitor, measure, and modify the plan for continuous improvement in social and emotional learning & leadership using data-based instructional leadership to positively impact climate and culture Implement a school-wide SEL curriculum

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In order to see an increase in subject proficiency in all subgroups, Lake Silver will focus on instructional strategies learned through the District PLC. Current data indicates a disparity amongst the subgroups. 73% of the white student were proficient in ELA as compared to the proficiency of our Black students (38%), Hispanic students (59%), SWD (25%), ELL (48%), and FRL (41%). Whereas 84% of the White students were proficient in Math as compared to Black students (41%), Hispanic students (53%), SWD (25%), ELL (48%), and FRL (40%). In Science, 71% of our White students were proficient compared to the proficiency of Black students (28%), Hispanic students (60%), SWD (27%), and FRL (30%).

Measureable Outcome: Student proficiency will increase within the subgroups as reflected by a 20% decrease in the achievement gap when compared to the White students in ELA, Math, and Science. Students proficiency will increase for our Black students from 25% to 35%, Hispanic students from 58% to 65%, white students from 80% to 83%, SWD from 25% to 35%, and FRL from 41% to 50%.

Monitoring: Common Assessment data, PLC data meetings, individual teacher meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sheila Burke (sheila.burke@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Continue to provide DPLC strategies for close reading, text-dependent questions, and academic discourse. Using the four guiding questions for PLC we will analyze tier I data to provide for teachers to take collective responsibility for student learning rather than in isolation. Collect/review data from both common and formative assessments; discuss trends and needs identified by the data during meetings. Utilize data to inform instruction including such strategies as reteaching, acceleration, scaffolding, and differentiation. CWT will focus on academic discourse and writing to demonstrate learning. SWD was an area of need, ESE teachers will provide support within the classroom. A cohesive schedule was developed to ensure each SWD is provided appropriate supports. ESE teachers will receive collaborative teaching strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Successful implementation will produce learning gains as evidenced an increased percentage of scholars scoring at 70% or above on each common assessment. We will celebrate successful implementation by identifying model classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement

Collaboratively plan lessons are aligned to the standards while providing effective and differentiated instruction based on demonstrated student needs. Additionally, ensure academic discourse and academic notebooks are implemented within their plans

Person Responsible Sheila Burke (sheila.burke@ocps.net)

Implement effective PLCs to ensure that all students achieve at high levels.

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

Continue with support facilitation for our SWD to ensure they have access to grade-level standards with the support they need. ESE resource teachers will receive a refresher on collaborative teaching strategies.

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

Coaches will implement a coaching cycle with Tier II and Tier III teachers bimonthly and with tier I teachers monthly.

Person Responsible Zaida Torres (zaida.torres@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Description/Rationale: On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that (50% or more) 61% of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA).

Measureable Outcome: The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase of at least 17 percentage points from 39% to 56%.

Monitoring: Progress Monitoring will be completed through Literably bi-weekly. District Standards-Based Unit Assessments and Reassessment data will be monitored every 3 weeks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sheila Burke (sheila.burke@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. This instructional practice has a strong level of evidence.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: To support our Evidence-based Strategy we will be using Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI). LLI focuses on teaching students how to read and increasing their comprehension. If students can read more fluently then that will increase their comprehension. The stronger the comprehension, students would then be able to read grade-level text and increase their scores.

Action Steps to Implement

MTSS Problem Solving Teams meet regularly to ensure: Students are appropriately identified. Students are matched to appropriate interventions and intensity. Data analysis is routinely part of the process, and adjustments are made to interventions based on the MTSS Problem Solving Team’s findings.

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

Classroom walkthroughs are conducted regularly and ELA feedback is provided; when needed adjustments are made in common planning/PLCs.

Person Responsible Charlotte Bigio (charlotte.bigio@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The behavior team will monitor student behavior data- classroom/ district referrals, code calls, etc.-school-wide (Tier 1) to see how effective the SEL curriculum is being implemented on a classroom level. The team will use this data to determine which student will need to receive additional support (Tiers 2/3).

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

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

Lake Silver hosts monthly events where families are invited to join faculty and staff in an effort to foster relationships and inform families about the curriculum being taught. Our goal is to inform families and to build relationships so that school and home are working collaboratively to ensure optimal student academic success. In an effort to communicate the school's mission and vision, the principal sends out a

weekly ConnectEd message called Tiger Talk which informs parents about details of the upcoming week and announces celebrations from the previous week. A weekly email provided by Constant Contact working in collaboration with the administration team will be sent on Sunday evenings containing information pertaining to all things Lake Silver and OCPS. Lake Silver has Report Card Conference Nights where parents meet with teachers to discuss student progress. Parents have access to Skyward where they can view their child's grades in all subjects. If a concern arises, teachers, resources, and/or administration will meet with parents to ensure that every child's needs are being met.