

Orange County Public Schools

# Lake Silver Elementary



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

# Lake Silver Elementary

2401 N RIO GRANDE AVE, Orlando, FL 32804

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Alyson Muse**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 <b>Students With Disabilities</b> White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (57%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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](http://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
Muse, Alyson	Principal	
Thompson, Carla	Instructional Coach	
McCauley, Robin	Teacher, ESE	
Holihan, Laura	Instructional Coach	
Redding, Ebonye	Dean	
Murray, Maria	Assistant Principal	
Kosobucki, Kaley	Other	MTSS Coach
Pedigo, Christen	Teacher, ESE	ESE Coach
Nelson, Adrienne	Instructional Coach	Math and Science Coach
Giessler, Josh	Instructional Coach	Behavior Specialist

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 8/1/2017, Alyson Muse

**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.*

8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

47

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (57%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**Early Warning Systems**

**Current Year**

**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	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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 7/15/2020

**Prior Year - 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	73	95	90	122	84	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	554
Attendance below 90 percent	12	17	14	18	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	3	11	11	13	16	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	30	5	2	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	33	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

**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	4	13	4	10	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

**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	1	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**Prior Year - 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	73	95	90	122	84	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	554
Attendance below 90 percent	12	17	14	18	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	3	11	11	13	16	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	30	5	2	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	33	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

**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	4	13	4	10	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

**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	1	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	51%	57%	57%	56%	56%	56%



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

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

**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	2019	49%	55%	-6%	58%	-9%
	2018	45%	55%	-10%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	57%	-1%	58%	-2%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
	2018	61%	55%	6%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
	2018	50%	61%	-11%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	63%	-5%	64%	-6%
	2018	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	52%	57%	-5%	60%	-8%

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
	2018	67%	59%	8%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019	44%	54%	-10%	53%	-9%
	2018	61%	53%	8%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
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				
WHT	73	77		84	74		71				
FRL	41	47	38	40	51	38	30				

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
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**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	405
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
----------------------	--

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Asian Students</b>	
-----------------------	--

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

<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
-----------------------------	--

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	76
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	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

During the 2018-19 school year the data component that performed the lowest was the lowest 25th Percentile for both ELA(43%) and Math (41%) as well as Science (44%). Reviewing the available data for 2019-20, iReady Mid-Year diagnostic, about 36% of our lowest 25% of 3rd through 5th grade met their annual typical growth in reading and about 24% of 3rd through 5th grade met their annual typical growth in math. Our third grade team consisted of new teachers to LSE and one of the classes had multiple teachers.

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

In 2018-19 the Science showed the greatest decline from prior year. We showed a decline that resulted in a 44%. During 19-20 school year we conducted district science progress monitoring assessments (PMA). With the cut-off score being 60%, we had 41% of our students show proficiency on the 2nd Science PMA. This year we had a math and

science coach as well as a STEAM lab that our 5th graders participated in throughout the year.

**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.**

During the 18-19 school year, our Math achievement had the biggest gap when compared to the state. Reviewing the available data for 2019-20, iReady Mid-Year diagnostic, about 12% of students made learning gains from the beginning of the year diagnostic. Students received push in support and interventions through the school year.

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

The ELA lowest 25 percentile showed the most improvement with from previous year. This year we implemented a rigorous intervention program for our tier III students. Students received prescribed interventions based on their iReady diagnostic results.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

Reflecting on the EWS data, the attendance and Level 1 on state assessment indicator are our areas of concern.

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

1. ELA and Math Proficiency
2. ELA and Math Lowest 25%
3. Science Achievement
4. ELA and Math Learning Gains
5. SWD ELA Achievement

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. 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 students 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 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%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Alyson Muse (alyson.muse@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 in increased percentage of scholars scoring at 70% or above on each common assessments. 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** Alyson Muse (alyson.muse@ocps.net)

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

**Person Responsible** Alyson Muse (alyson.muse@ocps.net)

Leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to focus on tier I instruction and provide feedback to teachers

**Person Responsible** Alyson Muse (alyson.muse@ocps.net)

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

**Person Responsible** Carla Thompson (carla.thompson2@ocps.net)

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

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

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Lake Silver Elementary will continue to support social emotional learning through the Sanford Harmony SEL Curriculum, integrate PBIS through Conscious Discipline and CHAMPS as a school-wide system to promote positive behavior. Additionally, we will refine our MTSS-Behavior system for specified students. In order to see academic achievement increase, we must foster a safe and positive learning environment which ensures that our students are in school, learning; however, during the 2019-2020 school year, there were 7 school suspensions and 70 discipline incidents that resulted in a referral which is a 56% decrease from the 2018-2019 school year. In the last 4 years, our discipline incidents that resulted in a referral decreased by 82%. Additionally, promote more access to culturally diverse literature.

**Measureable Outcome:** The number of discipline incidents that results in a referral will decrease from 7% to 5%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Ebonye Redding (ebonye.redding@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Referral data will be monitored to measure the effectiveness of PBIS, CHAMPS and Conscious Discipline implementation. There will also be documented MTSS Meetings involving behavior. Teachers will continue to teach SEL curriculum, Sanford Harmony, and infuse it into their social studies and health block.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The dean will collect data to track trends and form specific plans to meet the students' needs. The behavior specialist will meet once every two weeks to discuss MTSS in regards to specific students and their needs.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Review discipline data with staff and provide overview of code of conduct

**Person Responsible** Ebonye Redding (ebonye.redding@ocps.net)

Provide refresher training in Conscious Discipline to ensure caring classrooms are developed. Additionally, day 1 of Crisis Prevention Intervention training will be provided to all staff during the school year as one of our Wednesday afternoon PD.

**Person Responsible** Alyson Muse (alyson.muse@ocps.net)

MTSS team meet biweekly to review behavior data.

**Person Responsible** Ebonye Redding (ebonye.redding@ocps.net)

Provide teachers with a refresher of SEL curriculum for tier 1

**Person Responsible** Ebonye Redding (ebonye.redding@ocps.net)

Creating a team to begin the "READ WOKE" program to provide for more opportunities for students to be culturally diverse.



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

Create a Multicultural committee to enhance our awareness of various diversities within our school.

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

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**We will develop a plan to ensure that attendance for our students is tracked with fidelity and that meetings are set up between parents and school to ensure students are attending. Additionally, provide support for families that are struggling with transportation.**

## 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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Lake Silver hosts monthly events where families are invited to join faculty and staff in an effort to foster relationships and inform families about 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 announce celebrations from the previous week. A weekly email provided by Constant Contact working in collaboration with 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, resource and/or administration will meet with parents to ensure that every child's needs are being met.

### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Part V: Budget**

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction</b>				<b>\$218,495.16</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	100-Salaries	0521 - Lake Silver Elementary	Title, I Part A	2.73	\$119,495.16
<i>Notes: MTSS Coach - .59 Resource Teacher - 1.6 Interventionist - .54</i>						
	5000	500-Materials and Supplies	0521 - Lake Silver Elementary	General Fund		\$15,000.00
<i>Notes: LLI for Tier II and Tier III Interventions</i>						
	5000	500-Materials and Supplies	0521 - Lake Silver Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$12,000.00
<i>Notes: Core Connection Training Write Score program</i>						
	5000	140-Substitute Teachers	0521 - Lake Silver Elementary	General Fund		\$72,000.00
<i>Notes: Subs for training</i>						
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Social Emotional Learning</b>				<b>\$5,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	500-Materials and Supplies	0521 - Lake Silver Elementary	General Fund		\$5,000.00
<i>Notes: Conscious Discipline materials Printing services for PBIS posters</i>						
<b>Total:</b>						<b>\$223,495.16</b>