Whispering Oak Elementary

leadership
analysis
students
Florida
college and career
mission
school improvement
ambitious
family and community involvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
needs assessment
success
resources
areas of focus
instruction
supportive environment
growth
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Whispering Oak Elementary

15300 STONEYBROOK WEST PKWY, Winter Garden, FL 34787

https://whisperingoakes.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	21%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	A	A	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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and community

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title
Montgomery, Lee	Principal
Moore, Cathy	Instructional Coach
Stanley, Tiffany	Instructional Coach
Dawkins, Machael	Assistant Principal
Henry-Louis, Marie	Instructional Coach
Dickerson, Dana	Instructional Coach

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

*Lee Montgomery (Principal)

-Provides a common vision for the use of data based decision-making, collaborative lesson planning an effective instructional practices and intervention
-Manages school resources, including but not limited to: facilities, budget, personnel, materials and supplies that are designed to support the school improvement goals
-Oversees high quality, ongoing professional development to ensure teacher growth and student achievement
-Maintains communication with all stakeholder groups

*Dr. Machael Dawkins, (Assistant Principal): In addition to assisting the principal with staff assessments, she meets monthly with assigned teams to discuss progress monitoring and students in Tier 2 and Tier 3.
Monitors MTSS behavior data and implementation of school-wide expectations for SEL.
Works with implementing DPLC on campus
-Develops documents necessary to manage and display data that addresses goals and targets identified in the SIP

*Tiffany Stanley: (CRT)
-Provides professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and use to

drive instruction
-Facilitates all district and state assessments -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met and SIP goals are addressed
-Provides guidance with DPLC Plan
-Assists in data analysis
-Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning
-Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address goals identified in the SIP -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met and SIP goals are addressed

*Dana Dickerson (Instructional/MTSS Coach)
-Ensures that the school based team is implementing MTSS and addressing goals and targets in the SIP
-Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation -Ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation –
Communicates with parents regarding school based MTSS plans and activities –Attends Common Planning meetings
- Supports assigned grade levels

*Marie Henry Louis(Instructional Coach): -Provides professional development to teachers and staff regarding i-ready assessments to drive instruction
-Provides guidance with DPLC ELA Plan –
Assists in data analysis –
Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning –
Attend PLC and data meetings as assigned.
Supports ELL students with assessments and strategies for ELL assistance and compliance

*Cathy Moore: (Instructional Coach)
Provides professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and use to drive instruction
- Co-facilitates all district and state assessments
-Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met and SIP goals are addressed
-Provides guidance with K-12 ELA Plan
-Assists in data analysis
-Provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers in regards to data-based instructional planning
-Supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention plans that address goals identified in the SIP -Collaborates with staff to ensure student needs are met and SIP goals are addressed

The Leadership Team will attend PLC and data meetings as assigned. Members are responsible for understanding the curriculum at each grade level as well as their Tier II and Tier III intervention needs. Members will use data from grade level unit assessments, iReady, and other formative assessments to review and keep abreast of grade level needs.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	14	11	4	13	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	16	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	3	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

Date this data was collected
Monday 7/9/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	5	4	1	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	17	16	16	34	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	16	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	2	0	7	17	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	5	4	1	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	17	16	16	34	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	16	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	2	0	7	17	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The lowest data component came in the gains of the lowest 25% in math. This data component went down from 74% proficient in 2017 to 54% proficient in 2018. Historically, math gains have fluctuated.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year was the gains of the lowest 25% in math.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

All of our data components were higher than the state averages. Math gains of the lowest 25% was closest to being a gap (54% school to 47%state).

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Science data showed the most improvement moving from 79% to 87%. This is not a trend.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

The action that led to a change in the science score was an increased focus on close reading strategies in science combined with more hands on practice within the STEM lab.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	84%	56%	56%	83%	53%	52%

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	68%	55%	55%	67%	52%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	48%	48%	50%	42%	46%
Math Achievement	85%	63%	62%	89%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains	70%	57%	59%	78%	54%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	46%	47%	61%	41%	46%
Science Achievement	87%	55%	55%	90%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	14 (8)	11 (5)	4 (4)	13 (1)	5 (8)	10 (2)	57 (28)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (12)	3 (17)	4 (16)	1 (16)	1 (34)	1 (14)	10 (109)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (8)	16 (16)	5 (8)	35 (32)

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	2018	79%	55%	24%	57%	22%
	2017	79%	57%	22%	58%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	76%	54%	22%	56%	20%
	2017	92%	57%	35%	56%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2018	92%	55%	37%	55%	37%
	2017	78%	51%	27%	53%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	83%	61%	22%	62%	21%
	2017	82%	63%	19%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	74%	62%	12%	62%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2017	90%	64%	26%	64%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2018	91%	59%	32%	61%	30%
	2017	80%	56%	24%	57%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	86%	53%	33%	55%	31%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	49	53	52	49	47	41	58				
ELL	57	53		53	42	20					
ASN	95	71		92	81		100				
BLK	68	62	67	63	62	46	80				
HSP	78	73	70	80	66	33	76				
MUL	94	90		76	70						
WHT	87	66	70	90	71	63	90				
FRL	71	59	56	65	56	45	77				
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	53	59	54	51	61	50	38				
ELL	69	63		66	72						
ASN	90	79		95	96		93				
BLK	78	71	80	75	76		55				
HSP	77	73	57	83	87	83	74				
MUL	95	75		76	56		100				
WHT	86	79	68	86	82	71	80				
FRL	72	67	55	77	79	72	64				

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	MTSS and Differentiated Instructional Process (Division Priority - Narrow Achievement Gaps)
Rationale	In 2017-2018, only 49% of our students with disabilities (SWD) scored on grade level in ELA and only 49% scored on grade level in math. By targeting all students using the MTSS process, we will differentiate instruction for all learners in order to meet their specific needs. The MTSS process will allow for students' achievement gaps to be targeted to ensure they are receiving equitable standards based instruction.
Intended Outcome	Student achievement will increase with deeper implementation of the MTSS process through teacher utilization of data to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students
Point Person	Dana Dickerson (dana.dickerson2@ocps.net)
Action Step	
Description	1. MTSS school coach will participate in monthly MTSS meetings with individual teachers to include the review of data, the use of effective strategies, and the documentation for MTSS Tier II and Tier III meetings.

2. MTSS school coach will monitor Tier II and Tier III student interventions and progress.

3. Leadership team members will engage in grade level, common planning meetings to ensure student data and differentiated instruction are addressed.

4. MTSS school coach will participate in monthly MTSS meetings with individual teachers to include the review of data, the use of effective strategies, and the documentation for MTSS Tier II and Tier III meetings.

5. MTSS school coach will monitor Tier II and Tier III student interventions and progress.

6. Special Area, ESE and Regular Ed teachers meet regularly to share information on curriculum and individual student support needs.

7. Provide BPIE ratings for the staff and specifically focus on the lowest two indicators in relation to instruction and student achievement |
| **Person Responsible** | Dana Dickerson (dana.dickerson2@ocps.net) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| **Description** | -Leadership Team will monitor that training is held as scheduled and cover appropriate material to enhance the teachers' understanding and implementation of the MTSS process

-Professional development will be conducted to instruct teachers on how to graph data of Tier II and Tier III students with a peer group to determine the effectiveness of the intervention |

-Student performance data analyzed with individual teachers will include i-Ready diagnostic and
growth monitoring assessment scores. These will be reviewed to monitor the effects of differentiated instruction on student achievement. Evidence will also include increased student
proficiency scores on the FSA ELA and Math assessments.

-Leadership Team will monitor for understanding of the Florida standards, close reading/ complex text strategies and the instructional framework through classroom observations, coaching and frequent feedback.

-Teachers who have poor implementation practices will be provided additional coaching.

-Student data will be discussed at weekly meetings.

Person Responsible   Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)

Activity #2	
Title	Close Reading and Text Complexity through the DPLC Process (Division Priority - Accelerate Student Performance)
Rationale	Teachers will increase their knowledge and usage of proper close reading strategies to combine with increased understanding and implementation of Florida standards and the instructional framework in order to increase student achievement and teacher proficiency.
Intended Outcome	We should see an increased level of implementation throughout the year of strategies shared and observed through the DPLC process and increase in overall student achievement data.
Point Person	Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)

Action Step	
Description	1. Leadership Team will regularly review and discuss walk-through form to monitor for standards-based instruction 2. The assistant principal will act as the administrative lead to oversee and monitor MAO Initiatives 3. Teachers will attend PD on close reading strategies and will observe teachers who have been identified has having a model classroom. 4. Teachers will be paired to conduct instructional rounds in model classrooms 5. Leadership Team will regularly review and discuss walk-through form to monitor for increased positive trends 6. District lead professional development via our teacher leaders 7. Electronic resources (CRMs & iReady) and IMS resources utilized in lesson planning 8. Walk-through data and trends will be closely monitored as well as focusing on an increase in on-target student data 9. Culturally diverse texts and deliberate questioning techniques when planning standards aligned lessons and units will be expected during common planning meetings
Person Responsible	Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Leadership Team will monitor that the trainings are held as scheduled and cover appropriate material to enhance the teachers' understanding and implementation of Florida standards and the instructional framework along with the work on the DPLC.

The Leadership Team will also monitor for understanding of the Florida standards, close reading/complex text strategies and the instructional framework through classroom observations, coaching and frequent feedback.

Other forms of monitoring:
> Analyze formative assessment data

> Peer to Peer observations

> Guided visits

> I-observation data

Person Responsible   Lee Montgomery (lee.montgomery@ocps.net)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Open House Night is scheduled at the beginning of the school year. During this special night valuable information is presented to parents regarding but not limited to the curriculum, field trips, online technology programs that are available at school. Daily routines in the classroom, as well as at home for continued use to assist with sustainability of academic skills.
Mrs. Tiffany Stanley, Instructional Coach and Mrs. Connie Murphy, Resource STEM, will spearhead our school's Math and Science Curriculum Night this school year. Parents and students will participate in hands-on activities that are planned and focused on the curriculum as an enhancement of what has been taught by the teachers and learned by the students.

Students will take center stage on Portfolio Pride Nights! Our students' will chart their academic success throughout the school year and on the two designated nights they will share their work and personal growth with their parents. The teachers will also attend these nights facilitating and supporting their students with their presentation.

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

We refer qualified students and families to SedNet approved agencies for counseling. The school guidance counselor provides support groups for students emotional growth. The school nurse connects families with outside agencies to provide them with medical assistance to support continuous academic success.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Kindergarten Orientation for those students who will be entering kindergarten is held prior to the end of the school year. The parents and students participate in classroom and school tours to learn about the kindergarten curriculum as well as to see the school and all the activities they will be involved in when they enter school. Kindergarten assessments for our incoming students are offered during the summer. The data is then used to drive the instruction. Parents can sign-up during Kindergarten Orientation. The families that cannot attend the summer assessment selected dates will have their child assessed at the beginning of the school year.

Parents and students are encouraged to attend "Meet the Teacher" during pre-planning week.

Our fifth grade students attend a middle school visit to help with the transition.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) and classroom teachers meet to discuss data and progress monitoring of students in the bottom 30% in reading and math. During the meetings called "Child Chats" assessments are analyzed to identify students who are below, meeting or exceeding expectations. The SBLT provides support, resources, intervention and enrichment plans as needed for implementation. Our school will continue to decrease disproportionate classification in exceptional student education through MTSS process by providing and monitoring Tier 2 and Tier 3 level support.
SAI (Supplemental Academic Improvement) funds are utilized to purchase research-based intervention materials.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Students are exposed to careers through our Teach In program. Partners from the community work with students to review careers. Students visit Publix supermarket to learn about the service industry. Fifth qrade students take a field trip to the Sheraton Hotel to job shadow for a day.

Part V: Budget

Total:	**$13,000.00**